R.W. F. 4.
SR. 6 C8

A TREATISE OR IVSTIFICATION OF BOWING AT THE NAME OF *JESVS.*

By way of Answere to an Appendix *against it.*

TOGETHER WITH AN EXAMINATION of such considerable reasons as are made by Mr *Prinne* in a reply to Mr *Widdowes* concerning *the same argument.*

By WILLIAM PAGE *Bac: of Divinity and Fellow of* All-Soulne *Colledge in* Oxford.

Published by Command

Hab. 3. 18.
Exultabo in Deo IESV *meo.*

Bucer in cap. 1. Mat. vers. 21.
Vel sola hæc vox IESVS, *quantam quæso pijs & credentibus animis consolationem & fiduciam iure adferat?*

OXFORD
Printed by IOHN LICHFIELD Printer to the Famous Vniversity.
Ann. Dom. 1631.

UNIV·DUNELM·
BIB·ROUTHIANA
SB 2431

TO HIS DEARE MOTHER, THE FAMOVS AND FLOVRISHING Vniversity of *Oxford*.

RIGHT Worthy and much honoured Mother, that complant of the Bridegroome in the *Canticles*, *as a Lilly among Thornes so is my beloved among the Daughters*, was never more truely verefied then in these daies. For the Spouse of Christ is so prickt, goared, Cant. 2. 2.

wounded, and molested betweene two Wild factions, of the furious Nouelist and the firy Recusant, that a modest, sober, moderate, and peaceable Christian scarce now dares shew his head. For although these opposites differ in many things, yet they agree both together in this, to supplant and vndermine, to spoile and ruinate the Church of God: and like *Samsons* Foxes, though they seeme to runne contrary waies, yet are they tyed together by the tailes in divers fiery and dangerous conclusions, likely if they be suffered to run their course, to burne vp the Lords Harvest, and set the whole Christian World in a combustion.

I haue endeavoured according to my poore talent, to pluck one of these thornes out of the Churches side, and to binde vp the Wound; I leaue it to you (deare Mother) and to those sonnes of yours, who now are governours of the Church, *to take these foxes these little foxes that spoile the vines.*

Cant. 2. 15.

For these are the times long agoe prophecyed of by the Apostle, wherein *men shall bee proud, heady, high minded, fierce, despisers of government*

2 Tim. 3. 2. 3.
2 Pet. 2. 10.

verment, presumptuous, selfe willed, who are not afraid to speake evill of dignities: wee are fallen into these later & looser times of the World, wherein the lewdnesse of mens behaviour, and the licentiousnesse of their opinions, are growne to that height, that they cannot be content by their practise to violate, but they must also by their pens publiquely write against the good orders and iniunctions of our Church.

Thus it is with a *quondam* sonne of yours, (as he stiles himselfe) who hath long since published an Appendix against bowing at the name of *Iesus*, and of late hath dedicated a tract vnto you, in a reply of his against Mr *Widdowes*, wherein he labours to iustify his opinion; and not onely so, but hee makes a great complaint to you of Mr *Widdowes*, accusing him of many grosse faults, as he saies, and abusing him for them.

But I am afraid that vpon due examination the accuser will bee found guilty of as great, if not greater enormities, then the accused; and should haue done well to haue pluckt the beame out of his owne eye, be-

fore he medled with the mote in his brothers eye.

And therefore I muſt complaine to you (deare Mother) of the Complainant, ſome hereafter may perchance doe the like for me, and thus at length you may heare of all your ſonnes faults.

And that my complaint may be orderly and formall, I accuſe him firſt of a great error in iudgement, that hee out of an overweening opinion of his owne worth, ſhould preferre his owne skill and judgement before his mothers, and ſo croſſe that of Salomons, *my ſonne forſake not thy mothers teaching.* For he knoweth, or ſhould haue knowne, before he commended a booke vnto you, againſt bowing at the name of *Ieſus*, that you haue long agoe declared your ſelfe publiquely to be of another mind. And I know not how you ſhould take it well, that your yonge ſonne here ſhould goe about to inſtruct you, and correct you now in your old age. And as his iudgement is, ſo are his manners, he is not onely thus bold to gaineſay you, but he is very merry alſo and pleaſant to abuſe

Prov. 1. 8.

In the anſwere of the Vniverſity of *Oxford* to certaine Miniſters.

abuſe you, by telling you that *Ignoramus* to avoid the Plague fled from *Cambridge* to *Oxford* the laſt vacation, where hee was kindly entertained.

And why may not *Ignoramus* ſtep now and then to the vniverſities in a vacation, when he hath little elſe to doe, ſo that he bee carefull to keepe his Tearmes duly at London. But now he is long ſince returned to the place from whence he firſt came, where he ſtudies hard, and turnes ouer his Latine Dictionaries and his latine Authors to find this word hexameroon or hexamerῶν. For theſe be his words. *There is no ſuch latine word as hexameroon in any Latine Dictionary or author that I ever met with.* And no marvaile though he could not meete with it, for hexamerῶν being the genitiue caſe plurall of the Greeke word hexameron, cannot bee found in any Latine Dictionary or Greeke Lexicon what ſoever. Pag. 15.

But beſides this merry conceit of his, hee falls fowly vpon you, and tells you plainly, that the licenſing of Mr *Widdowes* his booke hath *expoſed, not only the author to the laſh, but* In his letter to Mr Vice-chancellor.

your

your selfe to vnexpiable disgrace whose honour and reputation because of this booke now lies at the stake.

Pag. 57.

In his letter to Mr Vicechancelor.

Strange it is, that a sonne of yours, *who beares such a reverend respect vnto you, and hath such a tender regard of your vnspotted fame*, as he saith, should yet notwithstanding so lash you, as to proclaime vnto the world that you haue exposed your selfe to such disgrace, as is not to be expiated.

In his Dedication.

Had you done any thing, that might preiudice or discredit you, it had bin the part of a louing & good natured child, to haue past it ouer, or if he must needs be talking of it, to haue excused, not published it to the world. For my part, I cannot blame you, but for that fault, which is commonly incident to Mothers, to wit, that you are too kind and indulgent to your children: for if you did but a little vse to *lash* vs whiles we are young and vnder your tuition, we should not bee so apt to *lash* you, when we are gone abroad. But that which you haue now done, for ought I perceiue, is no disgrace to you at all, but rather a Commendation, that hauing so duti-

full

full and zealous a ſonne of yours, who was ready to maintaine your quarrell to the vttermoſt of his power, like a tender hearted Mother, you would not diſcourage or diſharten him, but let him ſtrike a blow in your defence, although it might coſt him a fall. But to haue ſuch a ſtubborne & diſobedient ſon as this is, who bids open defiance vnto you, who vndertakes to controle you both in doctrine and manners, I ſay to haue ſuch a ſon is a part of your vnhappineſſe, more then your diſgrace.

But no marvaile though he be thus bold with you, ſeeing he endeavours to confute the whole Clergie of this land, who haue declared themſelues, as you haue done, that we ought to ſhew a lowly reverence at the name of *Jeſus*, when it is mentioned in divine ſervice: where you may conſider of three circumſtances, which doe much agravate your ſonnes fault. Canon 18.

The firſt is, that he is a very young man, one of your youngeſt ſonnes, who is thus buſy, and lifts vp himſelfe againſt the Church: for let young men prate what they

pleaſe

pleaſe, and write as many bookes as they liſt, yet thoſe that be auncient doe know, that they cannot haue that ſoundneſſe and ſolidity, that ripeneſſe of iudgement, and inſight into points of religion, as they ſhould, but this muſt come through fulneſſe of years, long ſtudy, and great experience. And therefore that modeſty of *Elihu* is to be commended, *I am young in yeares* (ſaith he) *and yee are auncient, therefore I doubted and was afraid to ſhew you my opinion, for I ſaid the daies ſhall ſpeake and the multitude of yeares ſhall ſhew wiſdome.* And although that be true which there followes, *great men are not* alwaies *wiſe, neither doe the aged* alwaies *vnderſtand iudgement.* For it may ſo fall out, that ſome young men may haue more iudgement and diſcretion then ſome that be aged. Yet moſt commonly it is otherwiſe, and ordinarily, ripeneſſe of iudgement and diſcretion, come through yeares and old age; but raſhneſſe and ſelfe conceitedneſſe are the companions and attendants of youth: therefore he ſhould haue taken that counſell of the ſonne of *Sirach: thou that art young ſpeake if neede bee yet ſcarce when thou art twiſe asked.*

Iob. 32. 6. 7.

verſ. 9.

Ecclus 32. 7.

Againe

Againe his fault is so much the greater, in thathe is out of his calling and profession. For whereas he telleth vs of many lay men both of former and later times who haue taken paines in writing; I deny not, but they haue done well and commendably, yet I hope not comparably with those who both of auncient and latter times haue written in the Church, I meane those learned and holy Fathers, Bishops, Doctors, and Pastors of the Church, vpon whom either wholly or principally all the whole strength of Christianity against Hereticks alwaies depended. And if any lay men haue cast in their mites into the vast treasury of Clergy writers, it is accepted; but when they sharpen their pens and wits against the Church, and the good ordinances and orders of the same, it shewes in them great pride that dare oppose, but little power in them to ouerthrow, what hath beene established vpon mature deliberation.

In his booke of a regenerate mans estate, preface to the reader.

And it is to be obserued, that amongst his lay writers he can make mention of Mr *Selden*; why could he not as easily thinke vpon Sr *James Sempell* and Sr *Henry Spelman*, who

 haue

haue like wise written vpon the same argument with Mr *Selden*? But I conceaue the reason of it, those worthy Writers deserue not to be remembred in his catalogue, because they haue learnedly and zealously written in defence of the Church and of her inheritance, but Mr *Selden* is most worthy of memory because he like this son of yours, shewed himselfe to be no favourer of the Church. But let them shew what skill they can, yet stil
1 Cor. 14. 30. it will be true, that *the spirits of the Prophets are* not *subiect* to them, but *to the Prophets*.

The last circumstance of aggravation is, that this sonne of yours being thus young, & also out of his owne profession, yet like some great *Goliah* dares defy the whole hoast of *Israell*, dares set himselfe against the whole clergy of this Land. what? had it not beene honour enough for him to contend with Dr *Bois*, with learned *Zanchy*, with iudicious *Hooker*, with admired Bishop *Andrews*, and some other worthy Divines; but that hee must quell and overthrow and blow vp all the divines of this Kingdome, from the highest Prelate to the lowest Curate, at one breath?

breath? He hath brought to passe that which *Caligula* wished for in the *Romans*, that they had all but one neck (for in these Canons & Constitutions of the Church we haue all but one neck) and will he like a *Caligula* cut vs off all at a blow? But let him strike, we are not all so soone cut off as he conceaues, there be some that will award the blow if they can; And let him take heede the blow doth not light vpon his owne neck.

It is his owne a lusion elsewhere.

Adde herevnto his abusing of our Communion by making a scurrilous, irreligious, carnall and prophane comparison of the standing of the table in some places North and South close to the wall, like vnto a dresser in a Kitchin; which comparison liked him so well, that he must make mention of it twise, once in his preface to the relation of the beginning of bowing at the name of *Iesus* and againe in the last page saue one of his booke in the margent. And will you know the reason of it, why he cannot like this posture, because thus saith he, *it is not like a table at which men vsually sit round*, obserue here that he will haue men sit at this table, against a

clauſe of our Common-praier booke, which will haue vs receaue kneeling, and wee muſt ſit round about the table, as if wee were at ſome ordinary; had hee not written againſt healths, I ſuppoſe he could haue beene content that we ſhould haue drunke a health, as men vſually doe at ordinaries: much like as I haue heard of one, who taking the Communion Cup, ſpake to his next neighbour & ſaid, here neighbour I drinke to you; ſuch carnall carriage and conceits, are fitter indeede for the kitchin, then the Church.

Laſtly I muſt complaine to you of his debaſing our ſinging of prayers in Churches Cathedrall by telling Mr *Widdowes* that the divells *ſurely will bow when he chaunts praiers in hell*: where beſides his vncharitableneſſe in aſſigning Mr *Widdowes* for hell, his irreligious and vnchriſtian opinion of our ſolemne ſinging of praiers, is to be obſerved, thinking hell to be the fitteſt place for ſuch chaunting.

Pag. 31.

Theſe be the complaints deare Mother, which I make vnto you of this your young forward ſonne, which I haue ſet downe plainly and roundly, for I thinke ſuch pub-

lique

lique and notorious offenders as this, ought to be thus dealt withall, for St *Paul* ſaith that *ſome muſt be reproved ſharpely, that they may bee ſound in the faith*, & certainly if any then thoſe who thus fiercely and openly oppoſe themſelues againſt the Church and againſt their mother the Vniverſity, againſt the governors, and goverment of them both. I cannot as he doth Mr *Widdowes*, leaue him to your correction becauſe he is not now vnder your goverment, but wherein I haue done amiſſe, I ſubmit my ſelfe to your Motherly cenſure, vnder which I ſhall alwaies continue.

Your obedient ſonne in deed
as well as in word.

WILLIAM PAGE.

ERRATA.

PAge 2.line 18 for ſpeake read ſpake, p.5.l.1. f.were r. where ib. l.7. f. one r.our,p.60.l.7.r. preface r.paraphraſe,p.91.l.25.f.worſhip r.worth p.93.l.14. f.willingly r. vnwillingly, p.126. l.17.leaue out forth,p.134. l.1. f.your r.the,p.146.l.25.f.Willet r.Fulke ib. l.30. f.Fulke r.Willet p.147 l.1. in the margent,read Rom.14.p.161.l.12. for ever r.every,p.171.l.14.f.to r.two p. 172.l.27.f.vnto r.vpon. p.173.l.9 leaue out names, p.177.l.12.f. and r.as, p.180.l.vlt.for ſonne read ſunne.

An Appendix concerning bowing at the name of Iesus: added, as for the satisfaction of some priuate friends, so for the publike clearing of the Truth in this particular Controversie, which now troubles many.

Answere.

A *Controversy which troubles many!* Nay rather you should haue forborne to rayse a controversy where none is, and none should be; for I know none that euer made a controversy of this before you; some indeede haue heretofore briefly shewed their dislike of it, amongst many other points; but I thinke none euer made a particular tract against it before now. And if you must needs be medling in controversies of Divinity, I could haue wished that you had bent your studies to mittigate and appease some of those contentions wee haue already, and not to multiply and stirre vp new broyles.

But this you say *troubles many*.

How many? I knowe none *troubled* with it through all the Christian world, but a few priuate men in some of our reformed Churches: and I know no reason why they should bee *troubled* with it, but that some it seemes, are desirous to be *troublesome*, to *trouble* themselues, and to *trouble* others also, by disturbing the peace and good orders of our Church, and by withdrawing the peoples minds from their dutifull obedience to the same.

But you haue a pretence for it, and that is, *for the publique clearing of the truth*.

But this is a common shelter for euery error; there hath beene no Heresy brought into the world but vnder this colour and pretext: For aske *Arrius*, and *Eunomius*, and *Macedonius*, *Manichæus*, and *Pelagius*, and all the rest of that ranck, and they will all tell you, that whatsoeuer they speak, or wrote, or taught against the Church, was for truths sake, and as you here say, *for the publique clearing of the truth*.

But you should haue considered that amongst these manifold contentions and controversyes in religion, which this age affordeth, it is no easy matter to finde out, what is truth: and therefore you should not presently haue setled vpon that for truth, which first seemed so to your apprehension. You should haue considered, whether our Church hath not long agoe declared her-selfe to be against your opinion: if she hath, (as I am afrayd I shall hereafter make it appeare,) then you should haue considered

considered what a bold attempt it would be for you, a yong man, and out of your calling too, to take vpon you to censure and controule the whole Cleargy of this land: and how vnlikely it is, that where the Church hath determined one way, that you should be able to take her tripping, and cleare the truth another way.

As for your *priuate freinds* I doe easily belieue that they will soone be *satisfyed*, for I suppose them all to leane to your opinion, before your appendix came forth: but whether you haue so *publiquely cleared the truth*, as you pretend: or whether indeed you haue not rather obscured it, it remaynes to be examined.

Appendix.

THe bowing of the head or knee at the name of *Iesus*, if it be any thing; must either be, *a duty of the Text*, as the *Sorbonists*, *Rhemists*, Bp. *Andrewes*, and Mr. *Adams* phrase it: or else *an indifferent, innocent, harmelesse Ceremony* (which *no man*, writes Mr *Hooker is constrained to vse*, though some now presse it as a duty) as *Zanchius*, Mr. *Hooker*, Dr. *Boyes*, and Mr. *Widdowes* stile it. But neither of these two is it, as I shall make it euident.

Answere.

Before I make answere to your Dilemma, giue me leaue to interpose thus much.

That the mayne and cheefe point in controversy betweene vs, is not, whether this bowing be a duty of the text, or no, but whether it be a canon and

constitution of the Church I say, the question is, whether the Church may, and hath lawfully commanded such a ceremony to be vsed: or whether it be Idolatry, superstition, and a breach of the third Comandement to obserue it, as you would make the world beleeue.

For although many mislike it as a duty drawn necessarily from these words of Saint *Paul*: yet I thinke there be but few of any note, that will ioyne with you in this, to abridge the Churches power in making ceremonyes at her pleasure, or mislike her act in ordayning this.

This I say is the principall and chiefest matter I intend to stand vpon, to wit, that this ceremony of bowing at the name of IESVS, is an innocent and harmelesse if not a religious and devoute institution, which the Church may well enact, and Christian people ought carefully to obserue and practise.

But if besides all this; it can further be proued, that this is also a duty of the text, or such a canon that the text doth countenance and giue iust occasion vnto the Church, to make and ordaine, then I hope if not for the Churches, yet for the authority of the Scripture, you will thinke it to be warrantable and of good vse.

And I must confesse, that when I first entred vpon this businesse, I thought it could not be so directly proued out of the text.

But when I had perused that learned and iudicious prelate BP. *Andrewes* vpon these words, who conquers

conquers were hee goes ; a man, to whose opinion (if to any mans) I durst subscribe, euen without examination, whom, for his profoundnesse of iudgement, variety of learning, and acutenesse of wit, the Christian world may iustly admire. Who hath carried such an eaven, and indifferent hand betweene one precise noueliſt and superstitious recusant, that he can scarce now haue a good word on either side, (for which doubtlesse his reward shall be greater in heauen) from whom we that are young diuines dare not dissent without some preface of apology, or excuse for our selues: yet *you* will vndertake to confute *him*, and vary from *him*, as easy as you can from the *Sorbonist s* and *Rhemists*, amongst whom you ranke him.

I say when I had read ouer *his* sermon and examined *his* reasons (for I cannot yeeld, no not to *his* authority without reason) I could not but condescend to his opinion.

Not, that I am so peremptory it is a duty of the text, as you are that it is not; but I am perswaded now that it may very probably be defended; euen out of that text.

Wherein notwithstanding if I faile, the cause in hand is no whit preiudiced, being principally defended vpon the Churches authority.

But for ought I perceiue yet, you must bring better reasons then any yet alleadged, before you perswade me that it is no duty of the text, in that sense as I shall hereafter declare, which when you, or any other haue done I will eiher satisfy them, or

subscribe, I labour not for victory, but for the truth.

I answere you in a word, it is both a duty of the text and a ceremony also, (though how it is a duty I shall shew afterwards) for you must know, that the text and word of God doth not only command vs all necessarie and substantiall duties that belong vnto Gods service; but doth often also enioyne the very circumstantiall and ceremoniall duties, some-
1. Cor. 14. 40. time in generall, as when it is said *Let all things be done decently and in order*, and sometimes in parti-
1 Cor, 11. 7. 10. cular, as when the Apostle would haue men to bee vncovered, and women to be couered in time of praying and prophecying. I would aske you here, whether this be a duty of the text, or a ceremony: I hope you will not deny it to be a duty; for the text is plaine [*a man ought not to couer his head*] vers. 7. Neither can you deny it to be a Ceremony, if wee take a ceremony, as it is commonly, [a] for an outward signe of some inward worship or service, or some other religious signification. You see then that the same thing may be both a duty of the text, and a ceremony also, so here:

[a] *Ceremoniæ sunt opera exteriora ad cultum Dei pertinentia.* Aquin. 1. 2. quest 99.

And although to be vncouered be a duty of the text, as you your selfe seeme to imply afterwards, yet the Church hath also interposed her authority for the more strict obseruing of it, as you may see in the 18th Cannon, because some peradventure haue not thought this to be the meaning of those words, or haue beene more carelesse in the due performing of it; So hath our Church, in the selfe same Can-

non

non, no doubt for the same reason, strictly enioyned this lowly reverence at the name of IESVS, although the text of *Philip*.2.9.10. may seeme to giue sufficient warrant for the same practise. And as the Church no doubt had relation to that text of the *Corinth*. in commanding vs to be vncouered, although it make no mention of it. So I make noe question but our Church had speciall relation to the text of *Philip*.2. in commanding vs to bow at this name, although it make noe mention of those words. So then, our writers, that you make so much to oppugne one another, may agree well enough in their opinions, when some call it a duty of the text, others a Ceremony, seeing it is both; but you will proue it is neither.

Append.

For first, it is no duty of the Text, *viz.* of *Phil*.2.9.10. as the first Patriots of it affirme: First, because this opinion doth vtterly disproue it to be an indifferent, arbitrary, humane Ceremony, as these latter make it: since no duty of the Text that hath immediate reference to the very person of Christ, * *as this bowing hath*, can be a ceremony, which is really distinguished from a religious duty.

* Bp *And*

Answere.

True Sir, if it were a morall and substantiall duty belonging vnto God, then could it not agree with a ceremony: but so long as it is but rituall and circumstantiall, a ceremony and it may agree well enough together; insomuch that I may well call it a ceremoniall

cerimoniall duty; which although it be indifferent in respect of Gods essentiall and substantiall seruice, yet is it in it selfe not only an innocent and harmelesse, but also a very vsefull, reuerent, and significant ceremony, but an humane ceremony, none of our authors call it; if they should so call it, their saying were true, for so farre the ceremony is a duty humane; as it results from the 18 canon, which being ecclesiasticall is humane. For one and the same ceremony may be a duty both divine and humane: for men prophecying, to be vncouered, is a ceremony; and because it is commanded, the same is also a duty: and because commanded in Scripture it is a ceremoniall duty divine or of the text; and because commanded by the Church it is also a ceremoniall duty humane or of the Canon. And the matter is very ordinary for one and the same duty to be commanded both by the law of God and men, as likewise for one and the same sinne to be forbidden by both those seuerall lawes.

Againe the learned *Bishop* doth not say this bowing hath immediate reference to the person of Christ but it is *mediante nomine*, this name coming betweene, we doe it to the name and from thence to the person; we diuide them not, but conioyne them, for these are the Bishops words, (*the text saith doe it to the name, the name is not the sound but the sense, the caution is easy then, doe it to the sense haue mind on him that is named and doe his name the honour and spare not.*) But suppose it had such immediate reference to Christ himselfe, might it not be a

Pag. 477.

be a ceremony for all this, for what shall we thinke of kneeling, lifting vp the hands and eyes vnto God in prayer, they haue immediate reference vnto God, yet I hope they be but Ceremonies.

But a *Ceremony is really distinguished from a religious duty.*

It is not; a ceremony indeede not commanded, is no duty: but any ceremony what soeuer it be, if it be commanded by lawfull authority, that ceremony is a duty; if by authority of the Scripture, it is a duty of the text: if of the Church, it is a duty of the Canon; Yea, and if it be a ceremony commanded in the service of God, we may well call it a religious duty, as religious is opposed to ciuill. But if by religious, you meane that which is inward, of the heart and syncere, and so opposite to outward, which may be fained & hypocriticall, then bowing of the knee is not the religious duty it selfe, but only a signe of it, as M. *Calvin* hath very well observed vpon this place. [a] *Adoration is here signified*, saith he, *which is proper vnto God, a signe or token whereof, is bowing of the knee.* So that this bowing of the knee is but an outward signe of that religious seruice and obedience we owe vnto Christ. For it is the subiection and bowing of the heart which makes the religious duty; otherwise if the bowing of the knee were the duty, then the *Iewes* were dutifull worshippers of Christ, when they bowed *their knees before him*; but because their hearts did not stoope to him; therefore the text saith they did but *mock him.*

[a] *Adoratio hic notatur, quæ est Dei propria, cuius symbolum est genuflectio.*

Mat. 27. 29.

Likewise, wee vse to bow to the King, and to our superiours: which bowing is not distinguished from our bowing to God by the outward act; it is the heart therefore that must distinguish and seuer them: for from my respect to my superiours, for Gods sake, I call this ciuill honour and reuerence; but from my relation and bowing to God for his owne sake, I call that religious and diuine worship: For sometime the text enioyneth vs the inward worship of God, as where it is said *God is a spirit and they that worship him, must worship him in spirit and in truth*, but doth not hereby exclude the outward.

Ioh. 4.24.

And sometimes againe it commandeth the outward, but alwaies includes the inward, as where it is said *giue vp your bodies a liuing sacrifice, holy and acceptable vnto God*, and so here, the bowing of the knee is commanded.

Rom. 12. 1.

And sometimes it commandeth both, as *come let vs worship*, there is the inward, *and fall downe and kneele before the Lord our maker*, there is the outward service; so then, this bowing, being but a signe of a religious Duty, may well enough be a ceremony; nay, I doe not see how it can be otherwise.

Psal. 95.6.

Append.

Secondly, because then it would be a hainous sinne, to omit this bowing at any mention or recitall of the name Iesus, though it were in swearing or blaspheaming; (a paradox which no Protestant, no writers yet affirme:) since

since the omission of any religious duty is a sinne. Thirdly, because then it should be a vniuersall bowing at the name of Iesus, when euer we either heare it read, or see it written; since the words of the Text are generall, without any limitation of time or place.

Answere.

I haue put your secondly and thirdly together, and so might you to, for they both make but one reason, which is this, if it be a duty of the text, then it should be an vniversall bowing at this name at all times and vpon all occasions, yea when it is named by swearing, since the omission of any religious duty is a sinne. I told you before, that this bowing is not the religious duty it selfe; but an outward signe and token of it. But suppose it were a religious, morall, and substantiall duty of the text, you know it is affirmatiue, and we haue a common rule of the Schooles, that affirmatiue precepts, though they alwaies bind vs, so that at no time it is lawfull to doe the contrary, yet doe they not binde vs, to all times, to all places, and to all occasions.

Præcepta affirmatiua obligant semper, non ad semper.

So for prayer and fasting, the scripture leaueth them at large; and for prayer doth seeme to binde vs to it alwaies, for St *Paul* saith *pray continually*, which is well expounded not of *euery time but of every opportunity*: if then we may truely and iustly limit a *substantiall* duty of Gods seruice to some certaine times, though the text seeme to enioyne it at all times: much more may we limit a *circumstantiall* duty belonging to God, especially when the

1 Thes 5.17.

ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ. non ἐν παντὶ χρόνῳ.

text leaues vs more at large: for the words are not, as you confesse afterwards: that we must bow at euery mention, sight, sound, or pronunciation of the name IESVS: Therefore it is in the Churches power to iudge of a fit time and opportunity; and she hath wisely and warily commanded it onely in the time and place of divine service: I say she commandeth it only at such a time, but doth not forbid men to bow at other convenient times, though for my part I thinke it fit we should be sparing to make vse of this name euen in time of diuine exercises, for feare of making the reuerence too cheap, much more in our common talke: yet if any when it is vpon good occasion named, shall shew their respect vnto it, I shall not misslike it: but no man will thinke it a fit time to shew such reverence, when men sweare by, or blaspheame this most holy name; this were to cast pearles before swine; the only reuerence he expects of vs then, is sharpely to rebuke those, who thus irreligiously prophane it.

Appendix.

But this bowing is no vniuersall duty, For *Pope Gregory* the 10th. (one of the first Fathers of it) restraines *it more especially to the celebrating of the Masse*: The Popish *councell of Basil*, prescribes it onely to *canonicall persons, whiles they are saying their canonicall howres in Cathedrall and Collegiate Churches*, where it is now most in vse: The *Provinciall Councell of Seine*, or *Sienna*, doth the like, in the very selfe same words. The *Synode of Augusta*, Anno Dom. 1548. cap. 23. as it extends this bowing to *the name of the Virgin Mary, and to the mention of the body and blood of Christ, and that before*

before the Altar, as well as to the name Iesus; so it *enioynes it solely to Ecclesiasticall persons, and that onely at Sermons and Masses*. Mr. *Hooker*, confines it onely to the *time whiles the Gospell is reading, at which men vsually stand*, (and therefore may more easily bow) *and to this time onely the custome of Christian men hath especially restrained it*, as he there records it. Since then this bowing at the name of Iesus is thus confined by the Papists, to *Collegiate and Cathedrall Churches, and to Ecclesiasticall or Canonicall persons onely, and that especially whiles their Masse is chaunting*; by Master *Hooker*, *and common custome to the Gospells onely* (which are neuer read but Lords dayes, and Holy dayes,) though some now vrge it further; either these limitations are directly sinful, at leastwise superstitious, in laying such restraints vpon a duty of the Text; or else this bowing can be no duty of the Text; because it is not vniuersall, either in respect of persons, time, or place, as other common religious duties are.

Answere.

Here you show a peece of rhetorique, and to make this bowing more odious to your reader, you tell him, that it was the invention of Popes; for here you name Gregory the tenth, and in your larger booke you name Pope Iohn the second to be one of the first that sett it on foote; after that, say you, it hath beene established by Popish Councells, and by them limited to certaine times.

But first it doth not appeare that either of these Popes were the foūders of it, for I haue good reasō to thinke, as I shall show, that this custome of bowing was farre more auncient in the Church though

how auncient, it is not easy to define. These Popes peraduenture when they perceiued men grow carelesse and slack in the performance of this ceremony, might make lawes for the more carefull and strict obseruing it; yet this makes them no founders, but ratifiers of this custome,

Secondly, though it had beene commanded by them, and practised in their Church to this day; must it therefore bee abhorred of all good christians? no, you must know, that the church of England is not so froward and aduerse, to mislike all that the Church of Rome holdeth; but onely where she swarueth from the right rule: but in that which she mayntaineth consonant to scripture, and good antiquity; the Church of England is not ashamed to ioyne hands with her.

Thirdly what neede you trouble your selfe with the Church of Rome? what matter is it, whether she command it or no? if you would but looke a little homeward, you might perceaue that it is an order and iniunction of our owne Church, to bow at the name of IESVS, for thus we read in the 18h Canon.

Canons and constitutions ecclesiasticall made by the convocation & licensed by King Iames. A.D. 1603.

When in time of Divine service the Lord *Iesus* shall be mentioned, due and lowly reverence shall be done by all persons present; as it hath beene accustomed, testifying by these outward ceremonies & gestures, their inward

inward humility, Christian resolution, and due acknowledgement that the Lord *Iesus Christ*, the true and eternall sonne of God is the only Sauiour of the World, in whom alone all the mercies, graces, and promises of God to mankind, for this life and the life to come, are fully and Wholy comprised.

The same you shall finde inioyned long before in the first yeare of Queene *Elizabeths* raigne.

That whensoeuer the name of *Iesus* shall be in any Lesson, Sermon, or otherwise in the Church pronounced, that due reuerence be made of all persons young and old with lowlinesse of courtesy, and vncouering of the heads of the mankinde, as therevnto doth necessarily belong, and heretofore hath bin accustomed.

Iniunctions of Queene Elizabeth A.D. 1559. Iniunct. 52.

Where you may obserue by the way, that in both these places, the Church did not make a new constitution, but only confirmed and established an ancient order practised in the Church long before; when it is said *as hath beene accustomed*. Adde herevnto the consent and ioynt approbation of the seminaries and seed-plats of the Church, to wit, the famous

famous Vniversities of our land. For when the desire of some was, that no ministers should be charged to teach their people to bow at the name of IESVS; the answere of our Vniversity of *Oxford*, to which also her sister of *Cambridge* subscribed, was this.

An answere of the Vniversity of *Oxford* to certaine Ministers: complaints, 1. Par. 10.

Reverence done at the name of IESVS *is no superstition, but an outward signe of our inward subiection to His diuine Maiesty, and an apparent token of our devotion: why doe they not likewise find fault with kneeling, sighing, weeping, lifting vp eyes, knocking of brests, holding vp of hands vnto Heaven, all which good men may vse in Gods service, though hypocrites doe otherwise.*

So that if there were no ground in Scripture for it, yet me thinkes the Churches authority should somewhat moue you; for *Salomon* doth not only say, *heare thy Fathers instruction*, that is, what God teacheth in his word; but he addeth also, *and forsake not thy Mothers teaching*, that is of the Church as the *Geneua* note will tell you.

Prou. 1. 8.

But *you* passe by this argument in your discourse as if it were not worth the answering, so little *you* esteeme of the Churches ordinances; but trample them vnder your feete, and passe so lightly ouer them, that they make no rub in your way, nor giue you any occasion to demurre.

A dutifull and discreete child, will not contest with his mother, but with a great deale of warines and humble submission vnto her: much lesse will he transgresse her commands, but with some preface

of

of excuse and apology for himselfe: but such are the humors of these times, and so thwart to all lawfull authority, that the very same act, if it were left to our owne free choice, wee would willingly performe; but when it comes backt with authority, we presently begin to suspect, that it is not so warrantable.

A law and custome of the Church, was thought heretofore to be a good argument of it selfe alone to convince others, & therefore St *Austin* was content to say no more against his adversary but this, *he is pressed downe with the weight of the Church his mother*, and *this is the authority of our Mother the Church:* and againe *the wholsome authority of the Church commends this vnto vs*. Great difference betweene S. *Austin* and *you*, he accounted the lawes and ordinances of the Church, to be a strong and conquering weapon against the adversaries of the Church: but you thinke it a reason, not worth the answering, not worth the naming.

Premitur mole matris ecclesiæ. Hoc habet authoritas matris ecclesiæ. Ser. 14. de verb. Apost.

Hoc ecclesiæ commendat saluberrima authoritas. lib. 3. de lib. arb.

Append.

Fourthly, because then the primitiue Church with all the forraine reformed Churches would certainely haue vsed it as a religious duty; (as it is manifest they never did) neither would the [a] *Protestant Churches* haue reiected, the learned [b] *Protestant writers* haue so frequently written a-

[a] See the Rhemists Notes on Phil. 2. sect. 2. on Apoc. 13. sect. 7.

[b] See the Authors quoted here, *Calvin, Marlorat, Beza, Junius*, and *Oleuian:* Comment. and Notæ, in Phil. 2. 9. 10. Bishop *Babington* his exposition of the Catholicke faith: in his workes pag. 195. 196, 197. D. *Whitakers*, in his answere to *William Reynolds*, p. 398. 399. Dr. *Willet* in his *Synosis Papismi, Centuria. 2. Error. 51*, and Commentary on Rom. 14. Controversie. 9. D. *Henry Airay* in his Lecture on Phil. 2. 9. 10. Dr. *Fulke*, and Mr *Cartwright*, Answer to the Rhemish Testament Notes on Phil. 2. sect. 2. and on Apoc. 13. sect 7. Mr *Perkins* in his discourse of Witchcraft, sect. 3. Mr *Charke* in his Answer to a scandalous Libell or Censure, &c. Mr *Thomas Wilson* in his exposition on the Romans, cap. 14. ver. 11, p. 601.

gainst it; much lesse all ancient and moderne Interpreters haue giuen a farre other construction of this Text, this name, this bowing, as they all haue done.

Answere.

First, how doe you know that the primitiue Church did not vse it: might they not vse many things that we are now ignorant of? especially if they were not of the substance, but ceremony of Gods service. And that it could not be a late invention of some Popes, as *you* imagine, Bishop *Whitgift* saith, it is of many hundred yeares continuance, and *Estius* out of *Vincentius* de *Valentia* reporteth that *according to the ancient and primitiue custome of the Christians, there is reuerence done only at the name of* IESVS; and moreouer Learned *Zanchy* vpon this text of the *Philip.* saith, that [b] *from hence no doubt came that most ancient custome in the Churches, that when Iesus is named all put off their hats, in testimony of reverence and adoration.* But why ioyne you the forraine reformed Churches with the Primitiue, as if they came neerest to the Primitiue times; and if the primitiue Church had vsed it, then certainly they would. You may thinke of forraine reformed Churches, as you please; I would they were so like the Primitiue times, as you imagine; then I am sure they must come neerer to the Church of England; but this by the way.

The Protestant Churches, say you, haue reiected it; and you proue this from the *Rhemists.*

What Mr *Prin*, are the *Rhemists* become men of credit

In Phil. 2. 10. *Veteri Christianorum more soli nomini Iesu quando nominatur fit reverentia.*

b *Atq; hinc non dubito quin profecta sit antiquissima consuetudo in ecclesiis, vt cum nominatur* Iesus, *omnes aperiant caput in testimonium reuerentiæ & adorationis.*

credit with you? Will you beleeue them on their word? You might as well belieue them when they call you heretick, for so in the same place, they call all them that reiect this custome of bowing. For my part, I will belieue neither you, nor them; for I am sure the Church of England (which is the flower of Protestant Churches whatsoeuer you thinke of it) doth not reiect it, but command it, as I haue proued to you in the 18 Canon; but you speake indefinitely, *the Protestant Churches*, As if they did all reiect it. But your mind and meaning sure is on the forraine protestant Churches, and there let it be.

Neither yet can you truly say so of all those forraine reformers, for what thinke you of the *Lutheran* Churches, the very first protestants and reformers, who retaine this custome of bowing the knee at the name of IESVS; and eagerly inveigh against those that deny it. If you belieue not mee read *Osiander* vpon these words to the *Philip*. St *Paul, saith he, by this genuflection would describe Christs kingdome, yet notwithstanding in the meane time it is a pious and Godly civility, and well becoming a good Christian; that wee doe bow our knees, and vncouer our heads at the mention of our Lord* IESVS: *not that this ceremony is a speciall worshippe of God, but that it is a good testimony of our reverence towards* IESVS *our Sauiour. But now adaies many Zuinglians, when they doe but heare the name of their prince, vncouer the head and bow their knees, but when they heare the name of* IESVS, *they stand with their hats on, as stiffe as stakes, but what mind they carry towards Christ, saith he, hereafter the euent will declare.*

Interim tamen pia est civilitas quod ad mentionē Domini Iesu genua flectimus & caput aperimus. &c.

Yea *Conradus Vorstius* in the name of all the reformed Churches in the low Countries saith thus in his apology for those Churches against the Iesuites, that although they haue no iniunction to doe it, yet saith he, if *any at the mention of God or Christ or* IESVS, *will shew some outward signe of honour and reverence, they may doe it for vs, and this we see dayly practised in our Churches, no man reprouing it, no man misliking it.*

Si quis ad mentionē Dei aut Christi aut Iesu &c. signum aliquod honoris exhibere velit, per nos sane licet, id q; passim in ecclesiis nostris fieri videmus, nemine reclamante, nemine indignante. Apolog. pro Eccles. orthod. disput 2. par. 5.

But the learned Protestant writers, say you, *haue frequently written against it.*

Speake out: what Protestant writers? whether all, or some onely? all you can not say, and yet you speake so indefinitely as if you ment all: you referre vs to your large bulke of Antiarminianisme, and there wee will see what summe of them you haue gathered together.

The first is *Calvin* vpon this place to the Phil: who as I conceaue writes not against the practise of bowing in our Church, but the abuse of it in popery.

Plus quam ridiculi sunt Sorbonici sophistæ.

The Sorbon Sophisters, saith he, *are here more then ridiculous, who gather out of this place that we must bow the knee so often as the name* IESVS *is pronounced, as if it were a magicall word, which hath all his force included in the sound; but* Saint Paul *speakes of honour, which is to be done to the son of God, not to the syllables of his name*. And herein *Calvin* surely doth well to reproue those who thinke, that there lyes any vertue in the sound or syllables of this name IESVS; where as we bow not to the sound, but to the sense

And thus *Vorstius* expounds *Calvin* in the forecited place. *par. 6.*

ſenſe and meaning of it, to wit, vnto him that ſaved vs, for ſaving vs.

Yet if ſome are of opinion, that *Calvins* words may be ſtretched further, and that he doth by them miſlike alſo our cuſtome of bowing; let him know, that the authority of the Church of England is to be preferred before many *Calvins*.

Your ſecond author is *Marlorat*, who ſaith no more then what he hath tranſcribed out of *Calvin*, *Bucer*, *Muſculus* and other authors.

Beza ſpeaketh not a word againſt it, but you are to blame to cite places and bringe no words of the authors; & ſo make your reader ſeeke vp and downe for nothing. If you would haue dealt fairely, you ſhould haue put downe theſe writers words, whereby your reader might iudge, whether our cuſtome of bowing were miſliked by them or no.

So likewiſe for *Iunius* I haue examined his notes vpon this place, and alſo his parallells, and finde not a worde againſt our bowing, vnles you will haue theſe againſt it: for vpon theſe words *every knee ſhall bow* his note is, *every creature ſhall at length be ſubiect vnto Chriſt*; What then? will not good Chriſtians be ſubiect before they muſt needes, and declare their ſubiection by their bowing; for ſubiection doth not exclude, but include bowing.

Lib. 2 parall. 25.

Omnis creatura tandem ſubiicietur Chriſto.

Olevian vpon theſe words ſaith thus, *that all creatures ſhould adore this* IESVS *as God manifeſted in the fleſh*, and I hope adoration doth not exclude the outward ſigne of it, to wit bowing.

Bp. *Babington* though he ſeeme to leane to your

opinion, yet saith, *that by this phrase of speech to wit bowing the knee; is ment subiection whereof bowing the knee is a signe,* and we desire no more.

Whitaker doth not deny this reuerence to the name of IESVS, but he addeth that we should do it likewise to the name of God and Christ, as well as to the name IESVS.

Doctor *Willet* saith thus, *Protestants haue onely taken away the superstitious abuse of the name* IESVS *in Popery, but we Iudge not, nether condemne those that doe vse it being free from superstition, and grounded in knowledge, and carefull not to giue offence* and such bowing ours is rightly called.

Doctor *Airy* saith thus, *by the name* IESVS *wee are not to vnderstand the bare name of* IESVS *as though it had the vertue in it to driue away Deuills, or as though at the very sound of it wewere to bow our knees; true it is that bowing of the knee at the name of* IESVS *is a custome which hath beene much vsed and may without offence be retayned, when the mind is free from superstition; but to bow and kneele at the very sound of the name when wee onely heare the name of* IESVS *sounding in our eares, but know not what the name meaneth, sauoureth of superstition.* In which words he iustifieth our manner of bowing.

Doctor *Fulke*, though he seeme to mislike much of popish bowing, yet hath these words. *Bowing may be vsed well when the mind is free from superstition, in the signe of reverence to his Maiestie, as in a matter wherein Christian liberty ought to haue place.*

Mr *Perkins*, not in the third section as you cite him, but

but chap. 4th sect. 1. speaketh onely against those who vse the name of IESVS to driue a way the Devill, or to prevent witchcraft; which practise I hope you will not lay to our charge.

Mr *Thomas Wilson*, saith no more but this, *that the corporall superstitious bowing of the knee to the letters and syllables of* IESVS *name is not to be proued by this text*, which I willingly grant, for we bow not to the sound of the letters, but to the sense and benefite of the name.

Mr. *Charke* I cannot finde, but I suppose he ioynes with the rest.

Mr *Cartwright* indeed seemeth directly to oppugne euen our custome also of bowing, and he is the only author, for ought I perceaue, you haue on your side. So then your vaunt here of the protestant writers is nothing, but comes to this issue, *the learned protestant writers haue frequently written against it*, that is to say Mr *Cartwright*.

The reader then may perceaue, there be not many learned protestants, that haue written against our bowing, no not so many as to make vp a number. And to this one author of yours, you shall giue me leaue to oppose one as learned a protestant writer, to say no more; I am sure a man of far greater eminency & place in our Church, that reverend Arch-Bishop *Whitegift*, who telleth vs in an answere to *Cartwhright*, that this gesture of capping and kneeing at the name of IESVS hath continued in the Church many hundred yeares, and yeeldeth this reason thereof, *that the Christians to signifie their faith* *Defens. tract. 21. cap. 7. pag. 742.*

faith in IESVS *and their obedience vnto him, and to confute by open gesture the wicked opinion of the Iewes and other infidels (who most abhorred that name) vsed to doe bodily reuerence at all tymes, when they heard the name of* IESVS, *but especially when the Gospell was read, which contained the glad tidings of saluation, which is procured vnto man by* Christ IESVS, *whereupon he is also called* IESVS, *that is a sauiour.* Whereof he inferreth, *neither can it be against Christianity, to shew bodily reuerence, when he is named, by whom not onely all the spirituall enemys of mankind are subdued, but also the faithfull be made partakers of the kingdome of heauen.*

Thus farr that reuerend prelate.

I, but all ancient and moderne Interpreters haue giuen a farre other construction of this text to the Philip.

Here is much boasting, but little performance. What, haue all the auncient, all the moderne Interpreters other wise expounded it? for the auncients I shall shew you anon, that there is no such matter, but can you say, that all the moderne are with you? what thinke you of that learned Bishop *Andrewes*, with *Zanchy* and diuers others before repeated? what can you say to *Calvin?* who not onely vpon this place to the *Philip*: but also vpon the two other parallell places *Rom.*14. *Isa.*54. will haue this bowing of the knee, to be ment of a corporall and externall gesture of the body; as you shall heare afterwards.

Appen.

Appendix.

Fiftly becauſe it is neither warranted by the expreſſe letter, nor yet by the Scope or meaning of this Text. Not by the expreſſe letter: For firſt, the words are not; that at euery mention, ſight, ſound, or pronunciation of the name Ieſus repreſented to the eye or eare, euery knee or head ſhould forthwith bow, there is no ſuch precept in the Text: but, *that in* (not at) *the name of Ieſus euery knee ſhall bow.* Secondly, the words are not: That at the name Ieſus; or when euer the name Ieſus is mentioned: but, *that in the name of Ieſus*, in the genitiue caſe: which denotes only the power or * perſon of the Lord Ieſus, not his particular name Ieſus.

* Hence Iſay 45.23. Rom. 14.11. are *Euery knee ſhall bow to me:* not too, or at my name.

Anſwere.

Here are two needleſſe and ſenſeleſſe curioſities. I ſay ſenſeleſſe, for if wee read this text *in* not *at*, as you would haue vs, what ſenſe can be made of theſe words, *that in the name of* IESVS *euery knee ſhall bow*. For bowing here is taken for an externall and viſible geſture of the body, as I ſhall proue anon. Now this bowing muſt haue relation to ſome obiect, vnto which we bow; which according to this reading, cannot be either the name of IESVS, or perſon of IESVS; for to bow in the name of IESVS, ſuppoſes IESVS to be the helpe and furtherance to obtaine what we bow for, not the obiect of our bowing: So that you would haue theſe words to be a bowing not of ſubiection only, but of petition and ſupplication, as if the Apoſtle had ſaid: *In the name of* IESVS *euery knee ſhall Bow*, to wit, *to God, the*

Father: and so indeede some would expound these words. But this cannot be, for these words, by the common exposition of Interpreters both old and new, are meant of the exaltation of Christs person; and so the very coherence of the text will inforce; for the Apostle spake before of Christs humility, which was peculiar to him, and to no other person, how he *humbled himselfe and became obedient to death, euen the death of the Crosse*, And here the Apostle telleth vs how God the Father hath exalted him for this his humility.

First in his person, *God hath highly exalted him*, and then in his very name, *and hath giuen him a name aboue euery name*, which name is not onely so great in it selfe, but to be so acknowledged by vs. First by the outward reverence of the knee, *that at the name of* IESVS *every knee shall bow*: and then by the confession of the tongue, *that every tongue should confesse that* IESVS CHRIST *is Lord*. All this belongeth properly and peculiarly to our blessed saiuiour, the second person in the holy Trinity; and this great honour is giuen to him, for his great humility. And least some should obiect and say, what, must CHRIST haue a name aboue euery name? And must all knees bow to this name aboue all other names? This may seeme to derogate from the power & maiesty of God: No, saith the Apostle, feare not, for this honour of Christ begins with the Father, hee was the cause of it, for *he exalted him*, and gaue him this name and this power. And as it began with him so it ends with him also, for so saith the

Apostle

Apostle in the words following, *vnto the glory of God the Father*. For it redounds to the glory of God the Father, that we should so much honour his sonne. Where, when the Apostle saith this bowing is *to the Glory of God the Father*, it plainely appeares that it is not done to the Father, as to the obiect, but to him only as the end of this bowing; vnlesse you will haue the Apostle to say thus; *euery knee shall bow in the name of* IESVS, to wit, *to the Father, to the glory of the Father*; and so make the Father both the obiect and end also of this bowing, which cannot be, for seeing this bowing is to the glory of the Father, as to the end, it is directed to some other, to wit, to the sonne, to bee performed to him as to the proper obiect of it.

εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ πατρός,

By this you may perceaue, that this bowing is *at* the name of IESVS; for to reade it *in* the name or power of IESVS notes no obiect of our bowing vnles *in* signifie *at*. For how shall any man know whē to Bow, when you say *in* the name or *in* the power of IESVS euery knee shall bow; but when wee read it *at* the name of IESVS, then wee know when to bow: and this reading doth well take away that scruple and feare that troubles you, for you thinke that wee bow to the very name, without relation to the person; but the Apostle prevents that obiection, for he doth not say, that we should bow τῷ ὀνόματι to the name of IESVS, as though this word IESVS were the vttermost extent of our bowing, but ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι *at the name of* IESVS; as if he should say, the bowing is to his person, the name is but the watch-

word, *at his name.*

The septuagint saith ἐν τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ. ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ. ἐν τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ. ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ. ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ. ἐν τοῖς δείπνοις. ἐν τῷ μύλωνι. ἐν τῷ πάσχα. ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις, ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ. ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ. ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ. ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ. ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ. καὶ ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ. ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ. ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ.

And this preposition ἐν may well be rendred *at*, for the Greekes doe commonly expresse *at*, by this preposition ἐν. So that where *at* is in the English, you shall finde very often ἐν in the Greeke, as *Deut.* 4.14. *the Lord commanded me* at *that time.* Thus *Ios.* 4.14. at *that day the Lord magnified* Ioshua *before all* Israell. So *Iudg.*4.4. *And there was* Deborah *a Prophetesse, the wife of* Lapidoth, *which iudged the people* at *that time.*

Come we to the new Testament *Mat.*11.25. at *that time* IESVS *answered and said.* And *Mat.*18.1. at *that hower came the desciples vnto* IESVS *&c.* Thus *Mat.*23.6. *They loue the vppermost roomes* at *feasts.* And *Mat.*24.41. *Two women shall be grinding* at *the Mill. Ioh.*2.23. *Now when he was in* Ierusalem at *the passeouer. Ioh.* 4.45. *The* Galileans *receaued him, hauing seene all the things that he did* at Ierusalem, at *the feast.* Thus *Ioh.*6.39. *And this is the fathers will, which hath sent me, that of all which he hath giuen me, I should loose nothing, but should raise it vp* at *the last day.* So *Ioh.*7.11. *Then the* Iewes *sought him* at *the feast.* And *Ioh.*11.24. Martha *said vnto him, I know that he shall rise againe in the resurrection* at *the last day.* Thus *Ioh.* 14.20. at *that day ye shall know that I am in the Father*; and againe *Ioh.*16.26. at *that day ye shall aske in my name.* Thus *Act.*7.13. *and* at *the second time* Ioseph *was made knowne vnto his brethren.* And *Act.*8.1. at *that time there was a great persecution.* Thus *Rom.*3.26. *to declare, I say,* at *this time his righteousnesse*

ousnesse. So here, the Father hath giuen the Sonne a name aboue euery name, that *at* the name of IESVS, &c. Many more places I suppose might be found out vpon diligent inquiry, where ἐν is to bee translated *at*. Adde herevnto that of the Poet, ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι. τι.

Nomine in Hectoreo, *pallida semper eram.* Ovid.

which must thus be rendred,

At Hectors name I still waxt pale.

And therefore our trauslators, who I am sure were as skilfull in the Greeke tongue as *you*, haue rendred it not *in* but *at the name of* IESVS *every knee shall bow.*

Againe, there is no difference betweene at the name IESVS, or *at* the name *of* IESVS in the genitiue case, as you imagine: Although it will bee a hard matter for you, with all the Greeke you haue, to proue that Ἰησοῦ must necessarily here be the genitiue case; for seeing it hath not τοῦ the participle of the genitiue case prefixed before it, why may it not be of the same case with ὀνόματι and so bee translated thus, *in the name* IESVS. But suppose it be of the genitiue case, it shall not helpe you; for this name IESVS, doth not denote his power, or person only, as you would haue it.

First not his power; for if you read it, In *the power of* IESVS *every knee shall bow*; there is no sense, no construction to be made of it, as I told you; because you mention bowing here, without any obiect to whom we must bow. If you read it, *At* the power of IESVS, neither yet by this reading doe we know when to bow; vnlesse this power being expressed

and signified vnto vs by some name or signe.

Secondly *name* cannot note onely the person of IESVS: for without question *name* there, is of the same signification with *name* immediatly before, when he saith, *he hath giuen him a name aboue euery name*: but *name* there doth not signifie person onely; because his person is declared in this word *him* he hath exalted *him* and giuen *him* a name: vnlesse you would haue vs read it thus; *hee hath giuen his person a person*, which were an idle reading, and senseleſſe tautology, therefore *name* both there and here, must properly signifie his particular name, and not his person onely.

Lastly your marginall note is to no purpose, for as I told you before, bowing *to* Christ and bowing *at* his name may well enough agree together, seeing Christ himselfe is the obiect of our bowing; his name is but the warning, or watchword. But if the words did run thus, that we should bow *to* his name; you must not take *name* here as severed from his person, but as conioyned with it, so that whosoeuer bowes to his name, bowes also to him.

Appendix.

Now every particular name by which the Lord Iesus is knowne, or stiled in the Scripture, as *Mediator*, *Saviour*, *Christ*, *Lord*, *Son of God*, *Lamb of God*, *God*, *Emanuel*, and the *like*, is as much, as truely the name of Iesus, as the name Iesus is, since they *notifie* the persō of Christ vnto vs as well, as properly, as really as it. If therefore the letter of this Text commādsthis bowing at the name Iesus, it requires the selfe same

bowing

bowing at the mention of all his other names and titles, since they are all as much, as truely the names of Iesus Christ as the name Iesus is: and this none doe presse, much lesse doe practise, as a duty of the Text.

Answere.

No maruaile though none doe presse or practise the bowing at other names of Christ, as a duty of the text; because we haue no text that wisheth vs to bow at the name *Mediator*, or *Christ*, or *Emanuel*, or *Sonne* of *God*, or *Lambe* of *God*; but for bowing at the name IESVS we haue this expresse text to the *Philip*: but the text will not content you; you must haue a reason also, why we should not bow to other names of Christ, *seeing they doe as properly and really notifie the person of Christ, as this name* IESVS *doth.*

I could answere you in a word; It is sufficient that God commands you to bow at this name, and hath not laid the like command vpon you to bow at any of his other names: and Gods command should be a sufficient rule, and reason to modest and humble Christians, though there can bee no reason shewed why or wherefore; for the reasō of his commands, as well as of his iudgements, is many times secret, though alwaies iust. Yet because you shall not thinke there can be no reason giuen for it, that God the Father would haue vs bow at this name aboue all the rest, I suppose it is chiefly in these three respects.

You must giue me leaue to take this for a duty, because I vndertake to satisfy all your arguments to the contrary.

First in respect of it selfe, because it is an humble and

and lowly name; for this name aboue all the rest noteth vnto vs his bitter death and passion, the last and lowest degree of his humiliation. For he was called IESVS; because, as the name signifieth, and the Angell told vs, *he should saue his people from their sinns*: but this sauing his people from their sinns was not till his death, nay was not, but by reason of his death. For as the Apostle telleth vs, *without shedding of blood there is no remission of sinns*, and againe *Christ was once offered to beare the sinns of many*.

Mat. 1. 21.

Heb. 9. 22. 28.

Therefore, from his dying and offering himselfe vpon the Crosse, became he our IESVS; then, and not before, was he a IESVS indeede: The name was giuen him by the Angell at his conception; but at his death, and not before, did he accomplish and finish that for which this name was giuen him. This then being the proper and peculiar name of his death, and bitter sufferings, must needs be a lowly & humble name. And as God delights to exalt humble and lowly persons, so also will hee haue humble and lowly names to be exalted. For it is not with God, as it is with men; his wayes, are not like our wayes; we exalt for greatnesse; he for goodnesse; we magnify men for power, and maiesty; he for pouertie, humility, and mercy.

Secondly, this name is to be exalted aboue the rest in respect of vs Christians, because it is vnto vs a gratious and sauing name: for as the Apostle saith, *there is no other name vnder heauen whereby we can be saued*, and therefore wee should aboue all the rest magnifie, honor, and advaunce this name. For alas, what

Act. 4. 12.

what good would all the other names of *Christ* doe vs, without this: what ſhould it profit me that he is a Lord, a Iudge, a King, a Prince; vnleſſe hee were alſo a IESVS; this is the name that is ſo comfortable, ſo beneficiall to vs aboue all the reſt. So then to anſwere your reaſon: what though *Christs* other names, doe as truely and properly notify his perſon, as this name IESVS doth? Yet doe they not ſo fully and really ſignify his office and function; his relation that he hath vnto vs in the great worke of our ſaluation; for no other name doth ſo plainely expreſſe this quality and condition of *ſauing* vs, and ſo proclaime him to be our *Sauiour*, as IESVS doth, which is a name of ſalvation, and nothing but ſalvation; this is the name for my vſe, for my euerlaſting good; this ſweet and bleſſed name will I not only honour, but loue; my bowing to it ſhall be a bowing of thankes-giuing, as well as of obedience.

Thirdly God would haue this name exalted aboue the reſt, becauſe of the *Iewes* and enimies of Chriſt; for this name eſpecially was to them an ignominious & contemptible name. This was the only name which was written ouer his head in ſcorne & deriſion, *This is* IESVS *the King of the* Iewes. This was the only name they vpbraided him withall. For the chiefe Prieſts *mocking him with the Scribes and Elders*, alluding to this name, ſaid *he ſaued others, himſelfe he cannot ſaue*, as if they ſhould ſay, he is like to proue a goodly IESVS, how ſhould he ſaue others, that cannot ſaue himſelfe? But O thou peruerſe *Iewe*, thou doſt little imagine; that

Mat. 27. 37.

Verſ. 40.

being to saue others, therefore he must not, he cannot, he will not, saue himselfe; for had he saued himselfe, others he could not saue. And this hath beene the name, that *Iewes* and other miscreants, haue alwaies euer since mocked the Christians withall, to wit, with their crucified IESVS. Therefore it pleased God in his wisedome, so much the more to extoll this name, by how much the more it was debased, and vilified by wicked men.

And it is worth our obseruing, that in those three things, to wit, *his person, his name, and his power*; in which the *Iewes* most of all mocked & derided our Sauiour, exalting them in scorne: in those very three it pleased God to recompense him, and make him amends by exalting them in good earnest, euen in this text to the *Phil.* For first they vilified his person, by exalting it in scorne vpon the crosse, for all to gaze vpon, and make sport: wherefore God hath set this person at his right hand, in all honour and glory, and so as the text hath it, *Hath highly exalted him*. Secondly they exalted this name IESVS in scorne, by writing ouer his head, *this is* IESVS *the King of the Iewes*. Wherefore God hath made this name to be aboue every name, that at this name of IESVS euery knee should bow, not in mockery as the *Iewes* did; but in good earnest. Lastly they exalted his power in derision, by confessing that he was the King of the *Iewes*, when they said *hayle King of the Iewes*: wherefore God hath giuen him all power in Heauen and Earth, and that *euery tongue shall confesse that* Iesus Christ *is the Lord*

Mat.27.37.

Mat.27.29.

and

and King of Kings indeede. Other reasons may be giuen why this name IESVS is so much to be reverenced; but I thinke these are the chiefe, and may suffice.

Thus haue I compared this name, with his other names only in generall; I will now come to them in particular. His name *Sauiour*, is but the translation of IESVS, now the text doth not say, we must doe it to the exposition of the name, for then wee must doe it to these words σωτης, and *Saluator*. Why we should not bow to the name *Christ*, as well as IESVS the learned Bishop giueth three reasons.

First, Christ *is not, cannot be the name of* God, *God cannot be annoynted, but* IESVS *is the name of* GOD *and the chiefe name of* GOD, *for who can saue from sinnes but* GOD *alone.*

Secondly the name Christ *is communicated by God the Father vnto others namely to Princes*, as touch not my Christs, *so is not* IESVS, *that is proper; I am a Sauiour, and there is no other besides me. And euer that which is proper is aboue that which is holden Common.*

Nolite tangere Christ. meos. Psal. 105. 15. Isa. 43. 11.

Thirdly Christ *is annointed, to what end? to be our Sauiour, that is the end then, and euer the end is aboue the meanes, ever the name of health aboue the name of medicine.*

This name, *Lamb of God*, noteth vnto vs his innocency rather then his sufferings, whereas our greatest comfort is in his passion. Yea the name IESVS, is to vs more worth then the very name of *God*: for *God* in him reconcileth the World; without him is enemy to it, and to vs; so with this name

there is comfort in the name of *God*, without it none at all: His other names, I shall haue occasion to compare with this seuerally afterwards.

Append.

Thirdly the words run not: That in the name of Iesus euery head shall bow; euery hat shall moue. There is no such Syllable in this *Scripture*; (and yet the litterall Expositors of this Text, doe more frequently bow their heads, & vaile their hats (whereas they should rather sit * vncouered in the house and presence of the Lord Iesus Christ) then bow their knees at the name of Iesus, though this Text requires it not.) But, *that in the name of Iesus euery knee should bow, of things in heauen and things in earth, & things vnder the earth.*

*1. Cor. 11. 4. 5. 7.

Answere.

I willingly admit of a figure here, not a metonimy, as you would haue, as though the effect were put for the cause, or the signe for the thing signified: but a Synechoche, where the part is put for the whole: for bowing of the knee here, is put for the outward expression of our subiection and obedience, by some bodily or visible gesture, which is done either by putting of the hat, by bowing of the body, by bending of the knee, or by falling prostrate vpon the ground. But because most commonly we expresse this ceremony of service, by the bowing of the knee, therefore bowing of the knee here is put for many of, or all the rest.

So *Salmeron* vpon this Text.

I say, I willingly admit of a Synecdoche here; because bowing of the knee doth thus signify in other places of Scripture; as in the second commaundement

maundement, where wee are forbidden to bow downe to grauen Images: we must conceaue, that we are also forbiddē to put off our hats to them, or to fall prostrate before them. Againe the Children of God are commended you know, that bowed not the knee to *Baall*, that is, as I vnderstand it, that did not shew any outward signe of honour or reverence to that Idoll, whether it were by putting off the hat, or bowing the body, or bending the knee: though I must confesse the Canon of our Church doth seeme to enioyne vs the bowing of the body, rather then any other obeysance: for the scraping of the leg, as it is in some places vsed, is troublesome, and not so seemely. For as you say well, our Church supposes that men should be vncouered all the time of divine seruice, of which order notwithstanding some friends of yours are least obseruant? but let that goe.

Yet here obserue that you can vrge Scripture for being vncouered in the Church, whereby you confesse that it is a duty of the Text; and you must likewise confesse, that it is but a ceremony: and yet can not see here, how bowing of the knee at the name of IESVS should be a duty of the Text, and a ceremony also; but this by the way.

This exposition of bowing the knee is playnely set downe by Master *Calvin* vpon these words, *every knee shall bow to me*; *Our Lord would clearely declare vnto vs that all men should not only acknowledge his deity, but should shew forth their confession of obedience, both in tongue, and outward gesture of the body*

Rom. 14. 11. *Et ore & externo corporis gestu, quem per genuflectionem design. nit.*

body, which is deciphered to vs by genuflection: where hee tells you that genuflection is put for any outward reuerence of the body, so that this genuflection doth not tye vs strictely to the litterall bowing of the knee, but to any other outward and sensible gesture of reverence and subiection. For by genuflexion is ment, not onely a motion of the legge, but any outward expresse obeysance done by the creature to signifie his inward deuotion, howsoeuer it be framed according to the custome of the people; whether by vncouering the head, or bending the body, or submission of the head, or whole body: thus in man or woman; but in Angells and spirits after their manner.

Appendix.

Which bowing being one and the same in kinde, applied first *to thinges in Heauen*, that is to *Angells and soules departed*, and last of all, *to things vnder the earth*, to wit, *to Devils and damned soules*, who haue no knees at all to bow, being spirits, cannot be construed in a litterall senee, of any actuall bowing of the knee to Christ, much lesse of any reall genuflection at euery recitall of his name Iesus, at which I neuer heard, nor read as yet, that Angels, Deuils, or soules departed euer bowed. This duty then is no way warranted by the expresse letter of this sacred Text.

Answere.

The reuerend Bishop hath allready answeared you, that the Apostle by attributing knees vnto Angells and soules departed, *humanum dicit*, speaks after the manner of men: for sure it is that the spirits

Page. 476.

of

of both kinds, as they doe yeeld reuerence to God; so they haue their wayes and meanes to expresse it, by some thing correspondent to the knee.

Secondly, if you take away bowing of the knee, you must also take away confessing with the tongue from them, for the Apostle saith here, *that every tongue must confesse*; and therefore surely they must haue tongues, and this the Apostle else where attributeth to them *with the tounges of men and Angels*, so that in their kind they haue not only knees, but tongues. 1 Cor. 13.1.

Thirdly by bowing the knee is meant some outward and visible reuerence, which no doubt is shewed by the Angells and Saints of God in heauen, as well as it is by vs in this world; for we read in the Revelation, that they are expressed diuers times *falling downe before the throne of God*; and when it is said of Christ *let all the Angels of God worship him*, I take it to bee vnderstood of some externall gesture, whereby the Angells shew their obeysance and subiection vnto Christ. For although I doe not hold them to be corporall, (which notwithstanding is the opiniõ of some learned diuines,) yet certainely in respect of that pure and simple essence, which is God him selfe, they are in a manner compounded and mixt substances. So then, though wee haue found no knees for Angells, yet we haue found out an outward gesture of obeysance and subiection, which they performe vnto Christ, which is sufficient and to our purpose. Revel. 4.10. 5.8.14.7. 11. Heb. 1.6.

Fourthly we shall finde knees, properly so taken for

for the Saints and sinners departed: for this bowing is primarily meant of bowing at the last day of Iudgment, as I shall shew anon: and then I hope, after the resurrection, the soules, as well of good as bad, will haue knees againe properly so called.

Append.

Much lesse is it proued by its scope or meaning. For first, the name Iesus (to which all this bowing is appropriated by all who presse it, either as a duty, or a Ceremony,) is not the name intended in this Text, at which euery knee must bow; as is most apparent. First, because this name *Iesus, was giuen to Christ by God the Father, before his Natiuity or Conception.* But the name in the Text, in which euery knee must bow, was not giuen to Christ till after his exaltation: as is euident, by the expresse words of the Text. *Wherefore God hath highly exalted him, and giuen him a name aboue every name, &c.* and by *Ephes:* 1.20.21.

Answere.

True sir, this name was giuen him before his natiuity, not for what he had done, but for what he was to doe: and therefore the Angell doth not say, thou shalt call his name IESVS, because he *hath* or *doth, but because he* shall *saue his people from their sinns*, which was not accomplished till his death and passion. For this name had neuer the perfect verifying and full christning as they say, till this day. For wee must not imagine that hee had one name at his birth, and another name newly given him at his exaltation, as you seeme to imply; but the same name which before, and at his passion was indeede

Mat.1.21.

indeed an humble and lowly name; a name then as I may say vnder euery name; after his suffering, and vpon his exaltation, God made this an high name, euen a name aboue euery name: before, no knee would bow vnto it, vnlesse it were in scorne and derision, as the *Iewes* did; but now it was a name vnto which euery knee must bow, not in iest, but in good earnest. And no maruaile; for now, and not till now he had merited by his bitter death and passion to haue his name so much exalted, as the text saith, *propter quod, wherefore,* or because he became thus *obedient to the death of the crosse, therefore God hath highly exalted him, and giuen him a name aboue euery name, that at the name of* IESVS *every knee should bow, &c.* And this *Cornelius a Lapide* hath well obseued vpon this Text, although the name of IESVS was giuen to him in his circumcision; yet was hee not then a Sauiour in proper and compleat manner, but only in inchoation, and neere appointment of God, [a] *therefore,* saith he, *the name of* Iesus *was giuen him at his circumcision, not for a present but for a future saluation.*

Mat. 27. 29.

[a] *Ideo nomẽ Iesu non a presenti, sed a futura salute Christo in circumcisione inditum est.*

Appendix.

Secondly, because Iesus, is a name that was principally giuen vnto Christ in regard of his humiliation and passion, not of his exaltation. As is euident, first; because it was *the first, the proper and only name that was giuen him vpon his incarnation.* Secondly, because it is the only *name by which all the Evangelists* stile him, *in relating the History of his passion, the very lowest degree of his humiliation:* by which

name the *other Apostles likewise vsually call him*, when they mention either his death, his sufferings, or debasements. Thirdly because, *it is the only name that was written euer his head, vpon the crosse.* But this name in the Text in which euery knee must bow, is a name expressing Christs exaltation, his soueraignty and glory, of which it is part: Therefore it is not the name Iesus, which was giuen to him only in respect of his humiliation.

Answere.

You proceede vpon a wrong ground, for all these reasons rather proue that IESVS is the name here intended, because it is an humble name; for it is more for the glory of God, to exalt a poore and lowly, then a high and lofty name; for it had beene no great matter, to exalt and aduance these names of *Sonne of God*, or *Lord*, or *King*, these are high and glorious names in themselues, and need no exaltation; but God in his wisdome and power would take a name out of the dust to exalt it; euen the lowest and most deiected name that Christ had; for it is the proper name of his passion, the lowest degree of his humiliation; to teach vs, that as the weaknesse of God is stronger then men, and the foolishnesse of God wiser then men, and the pouerty of God richer then men, and the debasement of God more glorious then men; so the very lowest and humblest name of God, doth farre exceede the loftiest and highest name of Men or Angells: therefore would God the father haue this name, which was a laughing stock to the *Iewes*, & a reproach to the *Gentiles*, to be exalted and magnified aboue all names both in heauen and earth.

[a] S. *Bernard* divides the names of Christ into names of mercy, and names of power: now God is more delighted (and so should wee too) with his names of mercy, then of maiestie; of pitty, then of power: And IESVS is the greatest name of mercy and pitty that euer was giuen, therefore God loues it, and would haue vs to loue and honour it; yea and so much the more, because it was so much debased and vilified by the enimies of the Crosse of Christ; let vs therefore say with devout *Bernard*, *By how much he detracted from his infinite greatnesse; by so much he added to his vnspeakable goodnesse, and the more he was humbled for me, the more shall he be honoured by me.* By how much hee became more vile and contemptible for my sake, by so much the more highly doe I honour and reuerence and loue him.

a *Nullum nomen reperietis quod non aut pietatis gratiam aut potentiam sonet maiestatis.* Bern. in Cant, Ser. 15.

Quanto minorem se fecit in humanitate, tanto maiorem se exhibuit in bonitate, & quanto pro me vilior tanto mihi charior. Ser. 1. In. Epiphan. Dom.

Appendix.

Thirdly, because this name Iesus denotes only the *Priesthood*, not the Kingdome, Royalty, Maiesty, and vniversall dominion of Christ: it proclaimes him only a Sauiour, not a Lord, a King, a Iudge of men and Angells. But this name in the Text, *is a name expressing the vniversall Monarchie, Supremacy, and Dominion of Christ ouer Angells, Men & Deuils*; Witnesse the very words of the Text. *Wherefore God hath highly exalted him, and giuen him a name aboue euery name, that in the name of Iesus euery knee should bow, &c.* Therefore it is not, it cannot bee the name Iesus.

Answere.

You goe vpon a wrong ground, as I told you before, to imagine that the name here intended must needs be a glorious and maiesticall name in it selfe. I, but say you, *the name* Iesus *proclames him only a Sauiour not a Lord, a King, a Iudge of men and Angells.*

What is this? It proclaimes him only a *Sauiour*: And what can any name proclame him more? What can any name proclaime him so much? Nay put them all together, and they come all short of this sweete and comfortable name of IESVS: for alas what succour, what comfort, what ease and reliefe had we miserable sinners and forlorne wretches found in these names of *Lord, King, Prince, Potentate, Iudge, Gouernour* and the like, without this name; for all these had beene but names of terror and confusion without a IESVS: this name IESVS proclaimes him God, it proclaimes him man, it proclaimes him all in all. *For when I name* IESVS (saith that devoute *Abbot*) *I propose to my selfe a man that is humble and meeke in heart, bountifull, sober, chast, mercifull, and one eminent in all kind of purity and integrity; and the very same man also to be God almighty who both healeth me by his examples, and strengthneth me by his helpe; all these offer themselues vnto me when I doe but heare this name* IESVS *sound in mine yeares. This word* Soter *that is Saviour*, saith *Tully*, *what a great word is it, so great that no one latine word is able to expresse the force of it*; I know not, neither is it much materiall, whether they haue any Latine word to translate the Greeke

Siquidem cum nomino Jesum hominem mihi propono mitem & humilem corde benignum sobrium castum misericordem. & omni deniq; honestate & castitate conspicuum, &c.

Hæc omnia mihi sonant cum insonuerit Jesus Ber. Ser. 15. in Cant.

Soter, *hoc quantum est ita magnum est, vt vno latino verbo exprimi non possit.* Orat. 4. in verrem.

Greeke word *Soter* by, that is Sauiour; this I am sure, that the tongue of men and Angells is not able to expresse the great benefit and blessing that we are partakers of by this sweet name IESVS; and yet you make small account of it, *it proclaimes him onely a Saviour.* Little I perceaue doe you consider what it is to be a Sauiour; you that would make the World belieue that all purity and reformation, all piety and religion, must liue and dy with you; is this your zeale and devotion to our blessed Sauiour, thus to slight and disesteeme his all gracious and all glorious name IESVS, a name that containes in it the greatest bowels of mercy and tender compassion that can be shewed to mankinde, for as the Apostle saith, greater loue then this shewed no man that one should lay downe his life for his friends, yet behold here is more, for *Christ* dyed for vs while we were his enimies, and yet with you, *Iesus proclaimes him only a Saviour.*

Was this nothing to him to be a Sauiour? What hunger and thirst did he suffer? What mocking and scoffing did he endure? nay what a bitter agony did he vndergoe? which made him to sweat great drops of blood, in what a case thinke you was he, when he cryed out *my God my God why hast thou forsaken me?* And all this was to be a Sauiour.

Againe, was this nothing to vs to be a Sauiour; yes all was to vs, and for vs. It is great ioy and comfort to be saued from temporall death and destruction; yet behold when we lay weltring in our owne blood, when by reason of sinne, we were the

vnhappy heires and bondslaues of eternall death and condemnation both of body and soule, then to heare of a Sauiour, what welcome newes is it, who can expresse the ioy that followes it? And yet you make light of it, *it proclames him only a Saviour.* I would I were able to make it sinke into our hearts seriously to consider what it is to bee a Sauiour. I will doe it as well as I can in S. *Bernards* words, who doth enlarge his meditations vpon this name.

Serm. 15. in Cant.

This name IESVS, saith he, *is vnto vs, both light, foode, and physick, First light, for did not God,* saith he, *in the light of this name call vs into his admirable light, which made* S. Paul *say of vs being thus enlightned, ye were darkenesse but now ye are light in the Lord.*

Neither is this name of IESVS *light alone to direct vs, but food also to refresh vs: art thou not so often strengthned, as often as thou calst this name to remembrance? What doth so much fatten the mind? What so much refresheth the wearied senses, strengthen the vertues in vs, quicken our good behauiour, nourish our chast affections, as this blessed name of* IESVS? *All the food of the soule is but dry, vnlesse it be moystned with this oyle, vnsavoury vnlesse it bee seasoned with this salt; if thou writest there is no tast in it, vnlesse I read there* IESVS; *if thou disputest, or conferrest, I relish it not, vnlesse I heare the sound of this name* IESVS: IESVS *is hony to my mouth, musick to my eare, a Iubile and sweet reioycing to my heart.*

Nec tantum lux est nomen Iesu, sed est & cibus, &c. Aridus est omnis animæ cibus, si non oleo isto infunditur, insipidus est si non hoc sale conditur: si scribas non sapit mihi nisi legero ibi Iesum, si disputes aut conferas non sapit mihi nisi sonuerit ibi Iesus: Iesus mel in ore, in aure melos, in corde iubilus.

This name IESVS *is also phisick to me; let any one be sorrowfull and heauy hearted, let him but thinke of*

Iesus

IESVS *in his heart, and vtter him in his mouth: and behold at the very rising of this glorious light, all clouds of care are remoued, all cleare againe.* Physitions tell vs of catholick receits to cure all diseases; they doe but talke of them, there is none of them that can make such: but IESVS I am sure is a Catholique remedy for all the diseases of my soule, *I follow his example as a man, and implore his helpe as a God, his severall examples are as so many severall drugs; but from his divine vertue I season them, and make my confection, such a confection that no Physition can afford the like*: this electuary thou hast ô my soule, *laid vp safe in the Casket of this one word* IESVS, *it is pretious and soveraigne without question, and will neuer faile to cure thee of any plague or sore whatsoeuer.*

What tell you me then of Lord, or King, or Iudge, tell me of a good *Samaritan* that will bind vp my wounds and powre in wine and oyle, and bring me to a place of repose, and take care of me: you know what *Iacob* sayd, when he heard that his sonne *Ioseph* was liueing. *It is enough*, Ioseph *my sonne is yet aliue*; so let euery good Christian say, It is enough, our God he is a IESVS; therefore let him be a Lord [a] to *Prynne*, a Iudge to some, and a King to others: but sweete sauiour bee thou to *me* a sauiour, say vnto *my* soule I am thy IESVS.

Sumo itaq; exemplum de homine & auxilium a potente illa tanquam pigmentarias species hæc tanquam vnde acuam eas & facio confectionem cui similem medicorum nemo facere possit: hoc tibi electuarium habes o anima mea reconditum in vasculo vocabuli huius quod est Iesus salutiferum certe quodq; nulli vnquam pesti tuæ inveniatur inefficax.

Ber. ser. 15. in Canti.

Gen. 45. 28.

a For this name he most magnifies.

Domine Iesu esto mihi Jesus, dic animæ meæ Iesus tuus ego sum.

Psal. 33. 3.

Appendix.

Fourthly, because the name intended in the Text, is such a name, *in which at the generall day of Iudgment euery knee shall*

shall bow of things in heauen, and things in earth, and things vnder the earth; But thus they cannot all bow in the name of Iesus: for Christ is *no Iesus to Angels, Devils and damned spirits*: these cannot call him Iesus, nor yet bow vnto him as a Sauiour, since he is no Sauiour vnto them. Therefore this is not the name in which these and euery other knee shall bow.

Answere.

What though he be no sauiour to the Deuils and damned spirits, yet he is their Iudge, and therefore they shall bow; though not willingly, yet against their wills; for so interpreters vnderstand the text, of a necessary subiection of all whether freinds or foes, will they, nill they, vnto this supreame Iudge of the world at the last day, according to that of the Apostle, *he must reigne vntill he hath put all his enimies vnder his feete.* Thus *Theophilact*, *Anselmus*, *Aquinas*, *Illiricus*, *Hunnius*, *Hyperius*, *Salmeron*, *Zanchy* and *Estius* vpon this text, and were I as ambitious of citing authors as you are, I could haue named twise as many.

1 Cor: 15.25.

But you say the Deuills cannot call him IESVS; what thinke you of these words of the *Evangelist*, *the Devills cryed out saying, what haue we to doe with thee* IESVS *thou sonne of God*; so then, they can call him IESVS, and acknowledge him to be a sauiour, though not to themselues, yet to others.

Mat: 8.29.

Appendix

Fiftly, because the name in which euery knee must bow, is a name aboue euery name, as the Text it selfe affirmes: But this

this name Iesus (though it bee a *sweet, a comfortable name to all true Christians who haue an interest in the Lord Iesus Christ*) is not a name aboue euery name: For first, it *hath beene giuen vnto diuers men besides Christ:*

Answere.

What then? the question is not whether other men haue had the same name or no, but who gaue them this name: for men may call one another by what names they please; but this name here is giuen vnto Christ by God himselfe, for it is God the father who hath exalted him, and the same Father who *donauit nomen, hath giuen him this name aboue every name:* For many may arrogate this name to themselues, to whom it doth not of right appertaine; for so wee haue a sort of men in the world, who call themselues after this name, *Iesuites* or of the society of IESVS; but this taking to themselues a name makes them neuer a whit the more belonging vnto IESVS; but he truely deserues this name, vpon whom it pleaseth God to bestow it, and that is his deare sonne our onely IESVS and alone Sauiour. This name hath God the father giuen his sonne, and to none other, for hee neuer called any one IESVS besides Christ; sometimes he calleth Princes by the name of Gods, as *I haue said ye are Gods*, and sometimes he calls them Christs, *touch not my Christs or myne annoynted*; but by the name of IESVS he neuer called any, but his onely begotten sonne, and our blessed Sauiour.

Some indeede there are called after this name

in the old testament; but first, these are but petty saviours, they doe but saue from temporall death and destruction; but this is a saviour indeede, that saues not our bodyes for a time, but our soules for euer; and therefore Saint *Bernard* doth fitly compare these sauiours to *Elias* staff which beeing laid vpon the Child could doe him no good, till the maister came who is Christ himselfe, and applyed his body to the Childs body, and so reviued.

Bernard: ser: 35. in Cant:

Secondly all these were types and figures of this sauiour, and therefore were no further sauiours, but as they did represent this true sauiour, which makes some say, that those three *Iesusses* mentioned in the old law, doe figure vnto vs the three offices of Christ.

Euseb. lib. 4. *de Demonstrat evangelica* cap. 29. Aust. lib. 12. cont: Faustum Manich: cap: 36.

For in IESVS *Nave* is figured power and might; in IESVS the sonne of *Syrach* wisdome and knowledge; In IESVS *Iosedech* goodnes and mercy; the first they say was a figure of Christ a King, the second of Christ a Prophet, the third of Christ a Priest.

Thirdly some are of opinion that these three were not called *Ioshuah*; which signifies a sauiour, but *Iehoshua*, which notes vnto vs thus much, *Deus salvabit*, *God will saue*, so that these names did but point vnto our IESVS, who was then to come. Thus *Petrus Galatinus lib. 3. De arcanis Theol: verit: cap. 20.* and *Iansenius concord. cap. 7.*

Appendix.

Secondly, it was ginen to Christ, *In regard of his Incarnation, Humiliation, and loweſt debaſement*, not of his ſupreme exaltation and glory:

Anſwere.

Therefore God would exalt it aboue other names, becauſe it was a lowly and abiect name to the world, as I haue told you at large, ſo that what you take to be an argument for you, is a ſtrong reaſon aginſt you: for this is one cauſe why God would haue this name exalted aboue the reſt, becauſe it was ſo much before depreſſed and debaſed more then the reſt; it was indeede his onely name of ignominy, ſuffering, and reproach. And beſides, he will make it appeare by this, that the very loweſt name of Chriſt, is farre aboue the name of any creature, yea to be adored by all the creatures.

Appendix.

Thirdly, it imports not the vniuerſall power, and Soueraignty of Chriſt ouer all the creatures.

Anſwere.

Your mind runs all on power, and greatnes, and maieſty, and ſoueraignty, but as I haue told you alſo before, Gods-ways are not like our wayes; you, like the world preferr for greatneſſe, God for goodnes; he honors and reſpects names of pitty and mer-

cy, more then names of power and maiesty.

Append.

Fourthly, the scriptures seeme to preferre other names and titles of Christ before it: As first, his name and title of *Lord*, of *King of Kings, and Lord of Lords*: which by the consent *of good Expositors*, is the name intended in this Text: and that for these reasons.

Answere.

Here M. *Prinne* layes about him lustily; and though the text be plaine enough, that the exalted name should be this name IESVS, yet he will haue it rather any other name then this, as though hee had a spight to this name aboue the rest; therefore now he saith the name here intended is Lord, or King, or Sonne of God, or Emanuell, or Mediator, or head of the Church, or Wonderfull, or Counsailor, or the Mighty God, or the Euerlasting Father, or the Prince of Peace: take which of these you please, so you will not haue it be the name IESVS, he is content: so ill he can away with it, that this poore name IESVS should here be vnderstood to be so glorious.

And first he will proue that Lord [a] is the name here intended, and he saith that he hath the consent of good expositors for it, but he bids me looke for them afterwards; and so I may, but yet finde none; howsoeuer he will proue it by reason.

[a] He labours much for this name, but when all is done this is no name, but a title or attribute of honour, for whoeuer either in his forename or surname, was called Lord.

Appendix.

Appendix.

First, because it is a *title of Soueraigne power and authority*; expressing and including, both the supreame Lordship and Dominion of Christ ouer all the creatures both in heauen and earth: and also the vniversall ioynt subiection of all the creatures to him, as to their soueraigne Lord and King, to whose Regiment and iudicature they are all subiected. Hence is it that the Scripture stiles the Sacrament *The Lords supper*; and the *Lords table*, The *Bread*, the *Cup*, the *Wine*, in the Sacrament, *The Lords Body*; *the Cup*, *and Blood of the Lord*: 1. *Cor.* 10. 20. *&c*, 11. 20. 26. 27. 29 Not the Supper, Table, Body, Cup, or blood of Iesus. The day of Christs Resurrection, *The Lords day Rev.* 1. 10. not Iesus his day: The day of Iudgement. *The day of the Lord*, not of Iesus.

Answere.

I haue often told you that you, mistake the very ground and reason of Gods exalting; for as he exalts humble and lowly men, so he loues to exalt humble and lowly names. This name *Lord* is a name great enough of it selfe, it needs no exaltation; but this name IESVS is a name of passion, suffering, and debasement; therefore would God exalt this name aboue other names: and besides, this name deserueth to be exalted by vs aboue all other, because we gaine most by this name, as I haue often signified before.

And the reason is plaine, why the Sacrament is not called IESVS his supper, or IESVS his table; because this name IESVS is not an actiue and power-

full name; but a passiue meeke, and lowly name: now when *Christ* doth institute Sacraments, and when any thing is done by his command or example, the Scripture vseth to apply vnto these actions names of power and authority, which are *Lord* and *Master*. So then the first day of the weeke is called the *Lords day*, and the last day of Iudgement the *day of the Lord*; because in these hee sheweth his power, might, maiestie, and soueraigne authority, so that vnto the name Lord we should bow and submit our selues indeed, but for feare, more then for loue: but vnto the name IESVS we yeeld a willing and thankefull knee, because it is so comfortable a name.

Append.

Secondly because it is the name which God gaue to the humanity, or rather to the whole person of Christ, after his exaltation, yea the very name & office that Christ died for to purchase. Witnesse that excellent and full place. *Acts* 2. 32.33.34.35.36. *This* Iesus *hath God raised vp, whereof we are now witnesses. Therefore being by the right hand of God exalted, and hauing receiued of the Father the promise of the holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this which you now see and heare. For* Dauid *is not ascended into the heauens; but he saith himselfe The Lord said vnto my Lord, sit thou on my right hande vntill I make thy foes thy foot-stoole. Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly that God hath made the same Iesus, whom ye haue crucified both Lord and Christ.* As also Rom.14.9. *For to this end Christ both died, and rose, and reuiued, that he might be Lord both of quick and dead, &c.* compared with v.6.8.10.11. and with the 1 Tim.6.13. 14.15. Rom.10.9.12.13. 1 Cor.8.5.6. Acts 10.36. Reu. 17.24. cap.19.16. Psalm.110.1.

Ans.

Answer.

None makes question but that besides the name IESVS, our Sauiour had other names giuen him; but all those were giuen him by reason of his name IESVS; for you your selfe confesse that he dyed to purchase this name Lord; so that this, and other names were but fruits and effects of his death and passion; but the cause of them was because he would be a IESVS to dy for vs; this was the proper name of his passion. For you must know Sir, that the very vpshot and perfection of our saluation consisted in his bitter death and blood shedding, all that went before were but prefaces and introductions to this; all that followed after, were but consequences and effects of this. Now by how much the cause is more excellent then the effect, by so much I may say the name IESVS is to bee preferred before the name LORD.

And this is all that your full place proueth, to wit, that the second person by becomming a IESVS for vs, by dying and thereby sauing vs from our sinnes, hath purchased to be the Lord both of quick and dead: neither doth your full place proue that *Lord* is any more intended in the text then *Christ*, being both alike mentioned, *God hath made the same Iesus both Lord and Christ*, and yet both of these names put them together make vp no more then the name IESVS: for *Lord* noteth his deity, *Christ* his humanity, but *Iesus* referreth vs to them both.

Append.

Append.

Thirdly, because it is such a name as doth fully expresse both the Deity and Humanity of Christ, the Deity being commonly called *Lord* in Scripture.

Answere.

Lord doth not expresse the deity and humanity of Christ, for the deity indeede as you say is commonly called *Lord* in Scripture, but you bring no place nor can doe, to proue that his humanity is called Lord; but *Iesus* doth fully expresse both: for *Iesus* is as much as one that saueth vs from our sins, which could not be without dying, for *without shedding of blood there is no remission*, now he could not dy for vs, vnlesse he had beene a man, and his death could not haue beene so effectuall, as to saue vs, vnlesse he had beene God also.

Heb.9.22.

Append.

Fourthly, because it is the very name by which *Angells, men, and Divells* in some sort, haue stiled, and *by which all men whether good or bad, (as the scripture doth expresly certify vs) shall call Christ at the last, when they shall all appeare at his tribunall:* Where they shall not, they cannot stile him Iesus, he being no vniversall sauiour vnto all men, much lesse vnto Divies.

Answer.

This argument was not so good that you needed to repeat it; For I told you before, that many shall submit to him, and acknowledge him to be a IESVS

to

to others, though not to themselues. I confesse all shall at the last day acknowledge him to be *Lord of Lords* and *King of Kings*, but this is not all; God will haue them doe reuerence and bow to the lowest and meanest name of Christ, a name which many of them haue scorned and derided: for this is that which will anger them most, and redound to the greatest glory of God.

Appendix.

Lastly, because this very Text informes vs, that *Lord*, is this name. For that Doubtlesse is the *name aboue euery name, in which euery knee shall bow, that euery tongue shall confesse at last*: since the bowing of the knee, and confession of the tongue, are here linked both together: But the Text informes vs: that the name which *euery tongue shall confesse at last*, is only this; that *Iesus Christ is Lord.* Therefore this questionlesse is the only name in which euery knee must bow; and not the name Iesus; which no auncient, no moderne Orthodox Interpreter, that I know off, * *one onely excepted*, did euer define to be the name aboue enery name that is principally intended in the Text.

*Bp. Andrew.

Answere.

What blind worke is here, to confound a simple terme with a complex? For who cannot with one eye easily perceaue that bowing the knee is to a name a single terme? But confession in the text, is not to a name or person, but to the truth of a proposition, to wit, *that Iesus Christ is the Lord*: for what logick or text did euer informe you that these words *Iesus Christ is Lord* is a name: or if it be a

name, must the name onely consist in the word *Lord* as you would haue it, and not as well in the word IESVS or *Christ*, which makes against you? So then, though bowing and confessing be here ioyned together, yet there is a difference betweene them, and the first is a step vnto the latter; for first we bow vnto the name *Iesus*, and least some should say, there is no reason why we should bow to this name, for *Iesus* is a lowly and despised name. I but the time shall come that euery tongue shall confesse that this *Iesus* is a glorious and all commanding name, to wit, that *Iesus Christ* is *Lord*, and hath all power giuen him in heauen and earth. This confession did *Peter* make long agoe before the *Iewes*, *therefore let all the house of Israell know* (saith he) *that God hath made the same* Iesus *whom ye haue crucified both Lord and Christ.*

Acts 2. 35. *Donauit Deus nomen quod est supra omne nomen domino & saluatori nostro Iesu Christo, est nomen supra omne nomen Iesus & quia est istud nomen supra omne nomen idcirco in nomine Iesu omne genu flectetur celestium, terrestrium & infernorum. Origen in lib. Iesu Naue hom: prim: verba prima.*

And whereas you say that no one expositor besides Bishop *Andrews* doth interpret this name here to be *Iesus*, you must know sir, that this learned and iudicious Prelate is not so singular in his exposition; you could not haue done an admirer of antiquity greater wrong, then to accuse him of such nouelty and singularity. But the Bishop is not alone in this.

Origen long agoe hath told vs, that *Iesus* is the name here at which we must bow. *God hath giuen a name which is aboue euery name vnto our Lord and Sauiour* Iesus Christ: *the name aboue euery name is* Iesus, saith he, *and because this name is aboue euery name therfore at the name* Iesus *shall euery knee bow*

both

both of things in Heauen and things in earth.

Thus *Bernard: his name shall be called admirable, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the euerlasting Father, the Prince of Peace, these indeede are great names,* [a] *but where is the name,* saith he, *which is aboue euery name: the name* Iesus, *at which euery knee shall bow.*

So likewise *Chrysologus, thou shalt bring forth a sonne, saith the Angell, and shalt call his name* Iesus, [b] *why* Iesus? *the Apostle tells vs, that at the name of* Iesus *euery knee should bow*, the like hee hath in *Ser.* 144.

So *Gorran* vpon this text, [c] *that at the name of* Iesus, *that is at this name which is* Iesus *euery knee should bow.*

And thus *Ambrosius Catharinus* vpon these words, *he hath giuen him a name aboue euery name,* [d] *this is that name* Iesus, saith he, *which signifieth a Saviour.*

Thus *Stella* vpon the 21 verse of *Luke.* 2. *That thou maist know, that God exalteth the humble, therefore to this little and lowly child hath God giuen a name, at which euery knee bowes of things in Heauen, and things in earth, and things vnder the earth.* [e] *Therefore it followes in the Text, his name was called* IESVS *of which name* Paul *saith, at the name of* IESVS *euery knee shall bow of things in Heauen, &c.* Phil. 2.

And thus *Aretius* vpon those words, speaking of this name giuen him at his circumcision, saith, [f] *that is the name which is aboue euery name, that at the name of* IESVS *every knee should bow of things in hea-*

a *Sed vbi est nomen quod est supra omne nomen, nomen Iesu, in quo omne genu flectetur. ser. 2. in Circumcis. Domini.*

b *Quare Iesum? Apostolus dicit vt in nomine Iesu omne genu flectatur cælestium, terrestrium & infernorum. Ser.* 145.

c *Vt in nomine Iesu, id est, in hoc nomine quod est Iesus.*

d *Hoc est illud nomē Iesus, quod significat salvatorem.*

e *Ideo sequitur in cōtextu, vocatū est nomen eius Jesus, de quo nomine Paulus ait in nomine Jesu omne genu &c.*

f *Nomen illud est quod est supra omne nomen vt in nomine Iesu omne genu flectatur &c.*

ven of things in earth, and thinges vnder the earth, Phil: 2.

So likewise *Haymo* vpon these words to the *Phil:* (he hath giuen him a name aboue every name.) [a] *that he should be* called, saith he, IESVS *that is a saviour.*

[a] *Vt Iesus vocaretur id est, Salvator.*

And *Erasmus* in his preface vpon this text. [b] *God the Father hath exalted his sonne vp on high, & being made famous by the humility and ignominy of his Crosse; hath ginen him a name which excells all humane glory: to wit, that now, at the name of that crucifyed and bespitted* IESVS, *every knee should bow and stoope.*

[b] *Largitum est nomẽ quod excellit omnem humanam gloriam, vt iam ad Iesu illius consputi & crucifixi nomen se flectat & submittat omne genu.*

And many more no doubt vpon diligent inquiry might be brought, but I suppose interpreters vpon these words were the more carelesse to put downe this name IESVS because they tooke it as a thing granted that IESVS must be the name, the text is so plaine, that it needes no exposition in this kind; yet I am not ignorant but that there be some who by name here thinke is meant, God, others the sonne of God, but I finde not so many agree vpon any one name, as vpon this.

Appendix.

Secondly, this Title, *the naturall onely begotten Sonne of God:* A name, *incommunicable to any creature, peculiar onely vnto Christ:* A name, *more excellent then any name of men or Angels:* A name, *declaratiuely giuen to the humanity or person of Christ, after his resurrection*; and therefore in all these regards, by some [h] *good Expositors* it is taken to be the name aboue euery, intended in this Text.

[h] *Theophilact, Anselme, Musculus, Aretius,* and others.

Answere

Answere.

It is most true that this name, the naturall sonne of God is peculiar to Christ, & aboue any name of men or Angells, as are diuers other names of Christ also. Yet it doth not follow, that this is the name here intended to be bowed vnto: For *that* name is naturall vnto Christ, and before all time: *this* name here is an acquisite and purchased name in the fulnes of time; For Christ merited this name by dying for vs as the text importeth, *he humbled him selfe to death euen the death of the Crosse*, propter quod *wherefore* or for thus dying, God hath giuen him a name aboue euery name. So that the name here vnto which we must bow, is a name giuen vnto Christ in time; and therefore cannot be this name, *the naturall sonne of God*, which hee had from all eternity; as he was the sonne of God he could not dy for vs, but as IESVS, he could and did suffer the ignominious death vpon the Crosse.

Secondly as the person, so the name here exalted was an humble and lowly name, and therefore needed, and therefore deserued exaltation: but to bee called the naturall and onely begotten sonne of God, is an excellent and glorious name in it selfe; that needeth no exaltation: for who would not reverence and adore that name.

Thirdly to be the sonne of God hath relation to the father, and not to vs: and what had we miserable sinners beene the better, for his being the sonne of God, (for thus he was before all time,) had he

not beene also the sonne of man in time, by taking flesh vpon him, dying for vs, and so became a IESVS vnto vs; in *that* name he would haue beene a seuere Iudge to punish vs; but no aduocate, or mediator to pleade for vs; and therefore in this name IESVS will we reioyce, this name IESVS we haue most reason to bow vnto.

Againe you talke like a slender divine, and not like one that is so orthodoxe, as you would seeme to be, when you say, *that to be called the sonne of God was giuen to the humanity of Christ*; true it is, that the person, which had assumed to it the humane nature, was, and is truely called the sonne of God; but you must take heede how you say, that this name was giuen to the humanity in the abstract: for then we may say, according to your diuinity, that the humanity was the sonne of God, which no orthodoxe Divine must say; for according to his humanity hee was the sonne of the blessed Virgin; wherevpon he commonly calls himselfe the sonne of man: but if in both respects as well of his humanity as of his deity, he were the sonne of God, then in no respect he was the sonne of man, which to say is no small error.

Lastly, your authors say no such matter, that this name here is the sonne of God, for *Aretius* saith thus (*he hath giuen him a name aboue every name*,) to wit, to *Christ that was man, and so to the whole person of* IESVS.

Anselme saith thus. *God exalted him according to his humane nature, where in also his divine nature*

may

may be said to be exalted according to the declaration and manifestation of it, for then it begun to be knowne what it was: so then, though his divine nature was exalted now because of its manifestation, yet his humane was exalted in both senses, both in appearance, and in very deede.

Theophilact will not exclude the humane nature from partaking of this honour, first he speakes of the flesh of Christ, how it was humbled, now speaking of his exaltation, *take this also of his flesh*, saith he. *Musculus* expounds it not of any one name, but of all his names and dignityes together, but will not haue it restrayned to any one particular name.

Appendix.

Thirdly, his name *Emanuel*, God with vs: A name peculiar vnto Christ; which not onely declares him to be God equall with the Father and the holy Ghost: but likewise to be God to vs, and God with vs, yea God in our Nature: And this is the name, at least in substance, which most of the *Fathers* take, to be the name aboue every name, intended in this Scripture: Who alleadge this place against the Arrians to proue Christ to be God coeternall, and coequall with his Father; interpreting this name to be nothing else, but this: *that Iesus Christ the second person in the Trinity, God and Man, is now since his exaltation in the glory of God the Father; that is, God coeternall and coequall with his Father.*

Answere.

I must confesse indeede, that *Emanuell* is a very gratious name of Christ, giuen at his birth, noting vnto vs both his God-head and his manhood; and so

so commeth very neere that function and office of Christ, wherein we most reioyce and triumph; yet doth it not fully expresse so much the loue of Christ vnto vs, as doth his name IESVS.

For first *Emanuell* being interpreted is no more then, *God with vs*; now God may be with vs in iudgement, as well as in mercy; for our punishment as well as for our pardon.

Gen. 2. Gen. 11. Gen. 18.

For thus he was with *Adam* in paradise, and with the builders of *Babell* to the confusion of their tongues; and also with *Sodome* and *Gomorrah* to their vtter overthrow: and therefore it is not enough that he be *Emanuell*, that is, God with vs; vnles he be also IESVS, that is with vs to our comfort and salvation.

And to showe the difference betweene *Emanuell* and IESVS, betweene *God being with vs*, and *God saving vs*. Saint *Bernard* hath this sweet meditation. *This sweete name* IESVS *sayth he, was very vsefull and necessary for me, otherwise if I should heare that the* Lord *is comming*, what *should I doe? should I not fly? like* Adam, *who fled indeed* from his face but fled not away: should I not despaire, when I hear that *he comes*; *whose lawe I haue transgressed*; *whose patience I haue abused; for whose blessings I haue beene found so vnthankfull? what greater comfort then can there be, then in a sweete attribute, then in a consolatory name? therefore he himselfe sayth, the sonne of man cometh not to Iudge the world, but that the world may be saued by him.* Now I come, *boldly vnto him, now I sup-*

a *Hoc dulce nomen Iesu, mihi maxime necessarium fuit, alioquin quid agerem, audiens dominum venientem, nunquid non fugerem? sicut Adam qui a facie eius fugit sed non effugit, &c. Quæ vero maior consolatio poterit esse, quam in dulci vocabulo, quam in nomine consolatorio? &c. Iam confidenter accedo iam supplico fiducialiter quid enim timeam quando salvator venit in domum meam. Bernard: ser: 10. de Epiph. Domini.*

I supplicate with confidence, for what should I bee afrayd of, when as my Saviour comes into my house.

Secondly it is not sufficient for vs, that he be God with vs; for so he may liue, remaine, and continue amongst vs; but giue me a name that notes vnto vs his passion and bitter death: for as the case stood with vs, we had beene neuer the better for his being a God, and also with vs, vnles he had likewise dyed for vs; for wee had a great burden of sinnes to be taken from vs; but without shedding of blood there could be no remission of them; what saith our Saviour? *verily verily I say vnto you, except a corne of wheat fall into the ground and dy, it abideth alone: but if it dy, it bringeth forth much fruit*: wherevpon sayth Saint *Bernard*, is it so sweete sauiour? *Let therefore this graine dy, and let the high standing corne of the Gentiles bee increased and multiplyed*. Now there is no name that doth so fully set forth the dying of our sauiour as his name IESVS: It is not then a God liuing but a God dying which crownes our comfort and ioy: no marvayle then though this death and passion of Christ wrought so much vpon the Apostles vnderstanding and his affection also; vpon his vnderstanding, for *he desired to know nothing but* IESVS Christ, what, and him borne, or working miracles, or keeping the law? no, but *and him crucified*. This also did wonderfully stirre vp his affection of ioy; *God for bid* saith he, *in a nother place, that I should reioyce but in the Crosse of our* Lord IESVS Christ that is in Christ crucified.

Iohn 12. 24.

Moriatur igitur granum, & surgat Gentium seges. Ser. 15. in Cant.

1 Cor. 2. 2.

Gal. 6. 14.

Appendix.

Fourthly, his name, *Mediator or Intercessor* which as it *is peculiar vnto Christ*; so it is *a name which he hath gained since his exaltation to the right hand of his Father, where he now sits to make intercession for vs.*

Answere.

I grant that this name Mediator is also a comfortable and peaceable name, and notes indeed a reconciler betweene two that are at odds; yet this name doth not so much set forth our misery and Gods mercy in our saluation, as doth the name IESVS.

For first a mediator may be betweene two that are fallen out, and both of them too blame, as it is commonly in the World when two fall out, there is vsually a fault on both sides; but such a mediator is not IESVS, for when God and man fell out, the fault was onely on mans side, he was only the party peccant; yet such was Gods goodnesse towards vs; who as though he had offended vs, seekes to be reconciled to vs; such a mediator is IESVS.

Againe a mediator may interceede betweene two that are fallen out, but they may be such, that doe not depend one vpon the other, either for their being, or well being; but will bee otherwise in good case both of them, though they neuer bee friends: But IESVS is a mediator, that supposes one party vtterly lost and vndone without reconciliation, a saving mediator presupposes one side to be in a miserable

rable and forlorne case. And therefore IESVS it is, and IESVS alone, that prompts vnto me, both Gods infinite mercy, and myne owne vnspeakable misery.

Appendix.

Fiftly, his title, *Head ouer all things to the Church*; a name peculiar vnto Christ, and a part or consequent of his exaltation; which denotes his supremacy ouer his whole body the Church; and their subordination and subiection vnto him. To which I might adde his other glorious Titles. *Isay 9.6. And his name shall be called, Wonderfull, Counsellor, The Mighty God, The everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace, the blessed and onely Potentate*, and the like, which because they most liuely and fully expresse the Maiestie, Deity, Kingdome, glory, exaltation, and soueraignty of Christ, are in this respect preferred aboue his name Iesus. Therefore it cannot be the name aboue every name, intended in the Text.

See Bernard, *Super Cantic.* Sermo 15.

Answer.

To be head ouer all things to the Church, is no proper name, but a title or attribute of Christ. If it were a name, it is so supereminent and commanding a name of it selfe, that it needs no exaltation; and this, as many other attributes of his, is but an effect and consequent of his name IESVS: neither neede you vrge these glorious titles of *Christ* out of *Isa.* for all these names are exalted, and high enough of themselues; whereas God intends in this place, to raise and honour no glorious name, but such a one as was ignominious to many; no high and imperi-

ous name, but an humble and lowly name, not a name of power and maiesty, but a name of pitty and mercy.

You bid me see *Bernard ser.* 15, *in Cant.* and so I haue, but I can see in it nothing that helpes you, but rather against you: for that sermon is nothing else but an extolling of this sweete and comfortable name IESVS. But I wish you to see the same *Bernard* in another place, and there you shall finde that he comprises all these glorious names of *Christ* within this name IESVS. *For* (saith he) Christ *was wonderfull in his Natiuity*, Counsellor *in his Preaching*, God *in working Miracles*, Mighty *in his passion*, *the euerlasting* Father *of the world to come in his resurrection, and the Prince of peace in perpetuall felicitie:* but then he addeth, *the vertue and effect of these sixe names, the Angell doth briefly and elegantly knit vp, in that one name, speaking vnto* Ioseph, *thou shalt call* (saith he) *his name* IESVS; you see then that according to Saint *Bernard* these titles as glorious as they are, yet they are all contayned with in the compasse of this sweete name IESVS.

Admirabilis in Natiuitate, Consiliarius in prædicatione, Deus in operatione, fortis in Passione, Pater futuri seculi in resurrectione, Princeps pacis in perpetua beatitudine.

Horum sex nominum consequentiam & virtutem breviter atq; eleganter comprehendit vno nomine angelus loquendo ad Ioseph *vocabis inquit nomen* IESVM Bern. parv. Serm. ser. 10.

Append.

Lastly, the very words of the Text; which runne in the genitiue case; *in the name of Iesus*, not in the ablatiue, that in the name Iesus: which make Lord, (If any expresse particular name) the *name aboue every name*, as I haue proued, (*by which name every tongue shall confesse Christ Iesus at the last:*) together with the whole current of ancient and moderne Comentators on this Text, doe infallibly disproue Iesus, to be the name intended in the Text: Therefore this bowing

bowing at the name of Iesus (which most take to be onely *the person, the power, and soueraigne authority*, not any peculiar name of Christ can be no duty of the Text.

Answere.

Here is nothing but a repetition of arguments already answered, but of all the rest, I wonder that you still crake of the whole current of old and new commentators, when you haue scarce one either old or new on your side. Againe I deny not, but name doth sometime signifie a person, power, and authority, as in some of these places alleadged by you, but it doth not alwayes signifie thus; but is sometimes taken properly, for a name indeed: witnesse that place to the *Hebrews* where the Apostle proues the preheminency of Christ aboue men or Angels, *a notatione nominis* from his very name *being made so much better then the Angells as he hath by inheritance obtayned a more excellent name then they, for vnto which of the Angels said he at any time thou art my sonne*, so likewise in the third commandement *thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vaine*. Who can expound name there, any otherwise then properly and litterally; but that name signifieth here, neither person, nor power, but this name IESVS, I haue sufficiently proved before. Heb: 1.4.5.

Append.

Secondly, the *bowing of the knee in the name of Iesus*, is not literally meant of any corporall or proper bowing of the knee either to the person or name of Christ, but only of

a metaphoricall. The bowing of the knee (as likewise of the head) is taken 4. manner of wayes in Scripture. First, *for externall reverence or veneration, due only to men*: Secondly, *for Divine worship or adoration due only to God.* Thirdly, *for the duty of prayer*, which men commonly performe *with bended knees*. Fourthly, *for subiection*: which is outwardly expressed among men by bowing the knee. The first of these bowings cannot be here intended, because it is due to men; whereas this is such a bowing as is due only to Christ, as God and man; as is due to him only in regard of his exaltation, and of his name aboue euery name: therefore a bowing of which no creature is capeable.

Answere.

You haue all this while laboured to proue that by name in the text is not meant the name IESVS, but rather any other name of Christ, here now you passe from the name, to the bowing of the knee: and you thinke that you haue learnedly distinguished bowing of the knee into foure kinds; but if you looke well into your division, you need make but two members of it, to wit, either civill reverence or divine worship; for whereas you say *thirdly that it is taken for the duty of prayer*, (though bowing of the knee is seldome taken for the duty itselfe, being but an adiunct, circumstance, and ceremony of that duty) I would know of you, whether that be not part of diuine worship to kneele vnto God in prayer.

And fourthly you say, *it is taken for subiection*. I demand whether this subiection be to God or man; if to God, then it is divine; if to man, then it is civill;

and

and so now there are but two parts to be seene of your foure. Though you mistake here all the while for bowing of the knee, is neither divine, or civill honor in it selfe, but a signe of either, according to the partie to whome it is applyed: the worship it selfe, is in the hart and affection of the bower.

Againe why may not the second of these bowings be here implyed, when as you your selfe say immediately before, that this is such a bowing as is due onely to Christ as God and man: and such a bowing whereof no creature is capable, therefore according to your owne verdit, it must be divine adoration, due onely to God.

Append.

The 2d. of these bowings cannot be here implied much lesse the 3d. because they extend not vnto Infidels, Devils, to wicked or damned soules: who though they be all subject vnto Christ as to a Lord, against their wills; yet they doe not worship, adore, or pray vnto him, as their Saviour; nor yeeld any voluntary honour, service, adoration, or obedience to him, as their God: They neither truely worship the Lord Iesus Christ, nor yet *pray vnto the Father in the name of Christ*, (which some take to be the meaning of this phrase;) Therefore these cannot be the bowings intended in this Text, since they extend not *vnto every knee of things in earth, and things vnder the earth*; which bow not thus to the person of Iesus, much lesse vnto his name.

Answere.

You suppose I see that in this text, no bowing is vnderstood, but a willing, ready and devout bowing; but I haue told you before, that the current exposi-

tion

tion of interpreters vnderstand it of both voluntary and involuntary bowing; for all shall bow one of these two wayes; those that will not bow willingly shall be made to bow against their wills; the originall saith *every knee shall bow* actiuely, and so seemeth to ayme at voluntary bowers: but the vulgar striketh at involuntary bowers, & therefore readeth it thus, *omne genu flectatur*, *every knee shall be bowed.*

πᾶν γόνυ κάμψῃ

And whereas you say, that some vnderstand these words *in the name of Iesus euery knee shall bow*, that men shall pray vnto the Father in the name of Christ; this cannot be the meaning of them, as I haue told you before; and besides all things in heaven, and earth, and vnder the earth, will not pray vnto the father in the name of Christ; vnlesse you will run into *Origens* opinion, to haue all men and devils saved; for those that can thus pray vnto God in the name of Christ, there is some hope of their salvation.

Appendix

The onely bowing then intended in this Text, is a [o] bowing of subiection, a necessary consequent of Christs exaltation, which implies a subiection of all those creattures vnto Christ, aboue whom he is exalted. This is a bowing which suites as well to Infidels, Devils, Iewes, and damned soules, as to Saints and Angells, as well to spirits and creatures wanting knees, as to men that haue knees: This is a bowing which all creatures, which all Angels, men, and Divils, shall ioyntly giue to Christ as last, as to their Soveraigne Lord, their King, and Iudge, when they shall all personally appeare before his iudgement seate to receiue a finall sentence from

o *Mihi flectetur omne genu, id est, omnis rigor & fotitudo humiliabitur meæ potestati, vt per flexionem genuũ intelligatur subiectio omnium.* Anselmus in Rom. 14. 11.

from him according to their workes: the onely time when this *Scripture* shall be litterally fulfilled in, and of which it is actually and principally intended. Witnesse Rom. 14.6. 9.10.11.12.Ephes:1.20.21.22.Rev:1.7.cap.5.8,to the end, cap.20.11.12.13.14.Mat:28.18.1 Cor: 15.24.25.27.28. Hebr.2.7.8.1 Pet: 3.22.Iohn 17.2.Acts.10.36.Col:1.17.18. 1 Cor.8.5.6.Isay 45.22.23.Dan.7.14.and other *Scriptures*, quoted in the margent. p. 192. numb. 2. which being all compared together, will infallibly euince this bowing of subiection to be the onely bowing intended in this Text.

Answere.

I grant without any more a doe, that a bowing of subiection is here intended in the text; but subiection is two fold, either inward of the hart, or outward expressed by some externall or bodily gesture: now vnlesse you proue, that in those places quoted by you, is meant inward subiection onely, you say nothing; for I confesse that by bowing is ment subiection, but not the inward without the outward; but rather the inward, as it is expressed by the outward: and this is the meaning of bowing the knee in these three famous and parallell places *Is*: 45.25. *Rom:* 14.11. *Phil:* 2.10. as I shall proue anon out of *Calvin*. But your mynd runs all vpon subiection without any bowing at all; nether doth *Anselmus* place make for you, for by bowing indeede is meant the subiection of all things; but he doth not say, this subiection is inward onely, and not outward.

This outward bowing of the knee will sute well enough to all men both good and bad at the last

day, for then all shall haue knees againe, the good willingly, the bad whether they will or no shall be made to stoope; this bowing of the knee sutes also well enough with good and bad Angells, for though they haue not knees properly so called, yet haue they something whereby they outwardly expresse their obedience and subiection vnto Christ, which is the meaning of bowing the knee as I haue proued before.

Againe, I graunt that this bowing is principally intended at the last day, and then is the only time when this scripture shall be truely fulfilled, and therefore you needed not haue brought so many places of scripture to proue it: for it appeares plaine enough by comparing this place with that parallell place *Rom.*14.11. where he speaks of this bowing and also sets downe the time *wee shall all stand before the Iudgement seat of God, for it is written, as I liue saith the Lord euery knee shall bow to me*, and without doubt euery knee will not bow till then; for not to speake of Heathens, Infidells, Turks, and all vnbeleeuers out of the Church; many that are Christians in the Church, haue stiffe knees and will not bow; and you your selfe it seemes, if there were no other, will hinder that this Text shall not be fulfilled yet.

But what will you gaine by all this; it is principally intended at the last day; therefore is there no intent, that any should bow in the meane time? It is litterally to be fulfilled then: may it not, nay must it not therefore be a fulfilling now, and so goe on by

by degrees to be more and more verified? For that which is principally intended, doth not take away that which is lesse principally vnderstood.

So that although all must bow then to IESVS whether they will or no, yet some that be good Christians in the meane time will & ought to bow to him willingly, & of a ready minde. And thus M. *Caluin* a man whose authority you will not easily deny, doth well expound this place: for making this obiection which you doe, that this bowing is to be at the last day of Iudgement, therefore not to be vrged now as a duty of the text; answereth thus, *that the condition of Christs kingdome is such that it increaseth dayly and groweth greater and greater, but yet so that it hath not his full perfection in this world, neither shall haue vntill the last day of Iudgement. So both of these be true, that all things are now subiected vnto Christ, and yet that this subiection shall not be full and compleat before the day of resurrection, because then shall be fully perfected, that which now is onely begunne: therefore this prophecy* (saith he) *not without good reason is applied to diverse times diversly, as all other prophecies, doe not perfect Christs kingdome in a moment of time, but doe describe it vnto vs in its whole circuit*; and indeede I take these words to be rather a prophecy, or prediction of what is to come, then a precept or duty of what is now to be done; I say rather a prophecy or prediction, if we looke vnto the principall scope and intent of the text; yet vnder this prophecy expressed, there is a duty implyed; for prophecyes are of two sorts,

Sed videt Paulus sibi male constare. Sta Christi regnum habere vt crescat in dies. Ac in melius provehatur: perfectionem vero nondum constare nec constaturam ante vltimum diem iudicii. Ita vtrunq; verum est vt Christo nunc subiecta esse omnia & tamen hanc subiectionē non fore plenam ante diem resurrectionis. Proinde vaticinium hoc nō absq; ratione diversis temporibus varie accommodatur. &c.

some that are fullfilled in an instant, others by degrees and by little and by little; this prophecy is of of the latter sort as Mr. *Calvin* very well obserueth. From hence then the Church of Christ thus reasoneth, shall all knees bow to his name at the last whether they will or no, and must this prophecy be a fulfilling in this life; then some ought to bow to it now; then certainely wee that be christians, and looke to be saued by him; are bound now by vertue of this prophecy, to doe his name that honour, seeing it is a prophecy which now must begin to be verified: so that euery good Christian heart can argue thus from these words: all shall bow then, therefore I must, I ought to bow now. The like is of confessing with the tongue, for if euery tongue must confesse that IESVS CHRIST is LORD, at the last day: are not we bound euen from these words to confesse him now in our tongues, and so turne this prophecy of all, into a precept vnto vs, yea though we had no other text to proue that wee must make an open confession with our tongues; and had it not beene for these words the Church doubtlesse, had neuer thought of this ceremony: for this will neuer bee verified till the end of the world, *every knee shall bow*, yet as I sayd, in the meane time some knees, I meane of good Christians; ought to bowe euen from this text; which bowing of ours I take to bee a bowing, not onely of subiection, but of gratitude and thankfull remembrance; so that when I put off my hatt, or bow my knee at the the name of IESVS, I doe not

onely

onely acknowledge his power and soueraignety over me; but I doe also call to mynde and in all humblenes acknowledge that inestimable favour he hath showed me in this name IESVS: so that my bowing of body and soule vnto his name is a reall thanksgiuing vnto him. And in our thanksgiuing vnto God I hope you will allow bowing; for as that learned Bishop hath observed, *it hath ever beene the manner in Christs Church that whether we offer vnto God, as here we doe, the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, or receaue ought offered from him, to doe it kneeling.* Pag. 478.

Appendix.

Witnesse *Clemens Alexand. Strom. l.* 1. *f* 72. *F. Irenæus Adversus Hareses. l.* 1. *c.* 2. *Tertullian De Trinitate lib. Tom.* 2. *p.* 260. *Cyprian De Bono Patientiæ lib: Tom:* 1. *pag:* 314. *Adversus Iudæos. l.* 2. *c.* 12. *Expositio in Symbolum. p.* 168. *Origen Homil.* 2. *Super. l. Iudicum. Tom.* 1. *f.* 178. *G. lib.* 9. *in Rom:* 14. *Tom.* 3. *fol:* 215. *Athanasius Contr. Arrianos l.* 2. *f.* 76. *De Incarnatione Christi, p.* 271. 278. *Hilarie De Trinitate, l.* 8. *f.* 53. b *l.* 9. *p.* 64. *and Enarrat. in Psal.* 2. *p.* 198. *Theophilus Antiochenus Comment. in* 4. *Evangelia. Bibl. Patrum. Tom.* 2. *p.* 148. *Basilius Magnus De Spiritu Sancto ad Amphyl: c* 8. *Tom.* 1. *p.* 180. *Greg. Nazienzen Oratio* 5. *De Filio. p.* 142, 143. *and Elias Ibidem Greg. Nissen Disput. De Anima & Resurrectione, p.* 194. 212. *Ambrose Hexaem. l.* 6. *c.* 9. *Enar. in Psal.* 118. *Octon.* 14. *and* 20. *Comment. l.* 10. *in Luc,* 20 *and in* Phil. 2. 9. 10. *Heirom Comment. l.* 13. *in Isaiam. c.* 45, *Comment in* Phil. 2. 9. 10. *and Com. l.* 2. *in Ephes.* 2, *Tom.* 6. *p.* 164. *b. and in c.* 3. *p.*[a] 174. *b. a notable full place. Cyrillus Hierusol. Catechesis.* 15. *Chrysostome Hom.* 32. *in* 1 *Cor.* 12, *and*

a *Et in alio loco ipse Apostolus; Vt in nomine inquit Iesu omne genu flectatur cælestium, terrestrium, & infernorum, non ad genua corporis, sed ad subiectionem mentis, & inclinationem animæ, cordisque obsequium pertinet, terræ secundum quantis.*

Sermo 7.*in Phil*,2.9.10. *Augustine De Trinitate. l.*1.*c.*13. *Quæstionum in Genes*, *Tit.*123. *Tractatus* 135. *in Ioannem. Tract. in Psal.*109. *and Contra Maximinum*, *lib.*2.*c.*2.*Theophylact Alexand. Episc. Epistola Paschalis.* 2. *Bib.* Patrum *Tom.* 4.*p.* 718.*Cyrillus Alexandrinus in Hesaiam. l.*4.*c.*45. *Oratio* 3. *Tom.*1.*p.* 312. *l.*5,*c.*55.*p.*362. *In Ioannem l.*17.*c.* 17.20.22.*De Incarnatione Unigeniti.c.*11. *and* 26. *Thesauri.lib.*13. *Tom.*2.*p.*270. *Primasius Sedulius*, *Remigius*, *Beda*, *Haymo*, *Anselme*, *Theodoret*, *Theophylact*, *and Oecumineus*, *in* Phil.2.9.10.*and in Rom* 14.*v.*8.*to* 13.*Pauli Orosij Apologia De Libertate Arbitrij contra* Pelagianos. *Bibl.* Patrum *Tom*,15.*p.*148.*H.*149. A.*Leo De Ieiunio* 10.*Mensis* Sermo. 1. *De Resurrectione Domini* Sermo 11, *c.*4. *De Natiuitate Dom.Sermo* 9.*c.*2.*De Ieiunio* 7. *Mensis Sermo* 6.*c.*2. *Epistol.Decretalium.Epist.* 11.14.81. *and* 95. *Chrysologus* Sermo 144.145. *Fulgentius Obiect. Arrian: Discussio p.* 204. *De Passione Domini; ad Transimundum. l.*3. *p.*414. *Damascen. Orthodoxa Fidei. l.*3.*c.*29. *Isiodor Hispalensis. Comment.in Genesim.c.* 30,*p.*301. *Bernard De Passione Domini* Sermo *Col:* 149.*F: Decreta Gaia Papa: Anno* 284. *c:* 4. *Surius Concil:Tom:*1.277. *Anathem. Cyrilli Declaratio, Anathematismus* 6.*Ibid*,*p.* 666. *Epistola Ioannis Papa* 2. *Anno* 531. *ad Valerium. Surius Tom*, 2. *p:* 386. *Synodus Francofurdia sub Adriano. Surius Tom.* 3. *p.* 247. *Paulini Aquiliensis Patriachæ: Contr. Felicem Vrgelium lib*, 2.*apud Alcuvini Opera Col.*1830.1801.*Alexand. Alensis Theologia Summa. pars* 1.*Quæst.*21,*Memb.*1.*Artic.*4. *and pars* 3. *Quest.*17.*Memb.*4.*Artic.*17. *Aelredus* Sermo 1. *in cap.* 13.*Isaia Bibl. Patrum. Tom.* 13. *pag.* 12.13. (who all likewise read this Text, *In nomine Iesu*,&c. not *Ad nomen:*) *Aquinas*, *Peter Lombard*, *Gorran*, *Bruno Salmeron*, *Estius*, *Glossa Ordinarlis*, *Lyra*, *Caluin*, *Musculus*, *Bullinger*, *Marlorat*, *Zanchius*, *Gualther*, *Olevian*, *Beza*, *Aretius*, *Hyperius*, *Hunnius*, *Tyndall*, *Dr.Fulke*, *Mr. Cartwright*, *and Dr. Airy.In Phil.*2.9.10. *Iunius Parellel*, *lib.*2. *in Rom.* 14. *v.*

10.11.

10.11. *Ferus, Luther. Komingstein, Sarcerius, Avenarius, Matthæus, Chrytæus, and Dr. Boyes*, in there *Postils on the Epistle on Palme Sunday: Cutbert Tonstall*, in his sermon on *Palme Sunday, on Phil. 2. printed* 1539. *Bishop Babington*, Dr. *Whitaker*, Mr. *Perkins*, Mr. *Charke*, and Dr. *Willet*. in their places formerly quoted in the Margent. p. 193. 194. who all with on consent, interpret this bowing of the knee in the Text, not of any corporall bowing of the knee (much lesse of the head or hat without the knee, which most now vse) at every mention or recitall of the name Iesus; *but of a vniversall ioynt subiection of all Angels, men, and Devils to the person, Scepter, power, and indicature of Christ, especially in the generall day of iudgement*: So that by all their severall Interpretations, this literall genuflexion at the name of Iesus is no precept, no duty of this Text; which giues no colour to it.

Answere.

I know not why you should bring such a multitude of quotations, as you haue done here and as many in your last tract, vnlesse you intend thereby to astonish your ignorant reader, and make him wonder at your great reading; and to weary out, and discourage your examiner.

But I am glad to heare that you rely so much vpon the authority of others; especially vpon the testimony of the auncient fathers, for many now adaies care not for them: and if you must needs be tampering with divinity, I would commend vnto you the reading and studying of them, and not only so, but the following of them, & harkning vnto them, when they agree together; and verily were all

all these Fathers on your side, as you pretend, I should very much incline to your assertiō; for I take the consent of Fathers, both in the exposition of any text of the Scripture, as also in other points, which are not drawne out of Scriptu re, so they bee not against Scripture, to be a very good rule for vs to follow. And would our aduersaries of Rome stand to this tryall, I am perswaded our controuersies betweene vs and them also would come to some happie issue.

But I am afraid your compilers haue herein done you some wrong; I could wish, you had brought fewer authors and to more purpose, for it is not the number of them that must prevaile, but the right application and strength of them, as Saint *Austin* saith somewhere vpon some other occasion, *noli numerare sed appende*, we must not take them by tale but by weight. For these Fathers and other writers here alleadged, proue not what you intend, or they proue what I deny not. They are brought to make good these two conclusions.

First that this bowing here is principally intended at the last day which I deny not, but haue before confessed and proued it.

Secondly that this bowing here intended is only the bowing of subiection, which also I deny not, But as I told you before, there is an inward subiection of the heart, and an outward subiection of the body; I say these testimonies here brought doe meane the inward subiection as it is expressed by the outward; you say, by them the inward subiection

iection without the outward is meant; if this appeare out of these authors, I yeeld; if the other bee proued, then all shall see how you haue abused your reader with a multitude of authors to no purpose.

I haue pervsed them all (where I passe by your misse alleadging of bookes and chapters many times you will say it is the fault of the printer) and there is not one place amongst them that saith by bowing or subiection here is meant the inward only; or that a man may probably gather such a construction from their words, but onely one; which you call your notable full place, and therefore can put the words at large in the margent, but you are afraid to put downe any words out of other fathers least you should be descryed. And it had beene better for your cause to haue brought but foure or fiue such places out of good authors, then all these you haue heaped together. I will not heare trouble the reader to answere their words till you bring them, for these and those in your other booke, will be sufficient to make a volume by themselues: and if you hereafter be disposed to put downe their words one after another, I will promise you, to vndertake the answere both of these and those in particular, for I know what is in them already. Onely thus much the reader shall know, that many of those writers both old and new, which you cite for only inward subiection; doe expressely say, that by bowing the knee here, is meant outward reverence and bodily gesture.

As First Saint *Ierome*, vpon that paralel place to

this of the *Phil: euery knee shall bow to me*, *Isa:* 45. 23. saith thus. *In which place is plainely decyphered vnto vs the condition of the Christian. For it is the custome of the Church now to bow the knee to* Christ, *which the* Iewes *shewing the stubbornenes & perversnesse of their minds altogether refuse to doe*, where by genuflection he must needs meane an outward expression of bodily reverence; otherwise it could not appeare whether the *Iewes* refused to shew this respect or no, if it were only inward. Besides you must obserue that it was a custome of the Church in his daies and not any mans private conceit or devotion.

In quo perspicuè significatur populus christianus; moris enim ecclesiastici est, Christo genuflectere, quod Iudæi mentis superbiam demonstrantes, omnino non faciunt.

The second is Saint *Ambrose lib. 6. hexam. cap. 9.* where speaking before of all the other parts of our body, at length he comes to the knee, and saith, *the knee is flexible, Whereby aboue all other meanes, both the offence against God is pacified, and his grace implored, for this is the guift of the Father bestowed vpon his sonne, that at the name of* IESVS *euery knee should bow of things in heauen and things in earth, and things vnder the earth.*

Flexibile genu quo præ cæteris Dei misigatur offensa, gratia provocatur: hoc enim Patris (nũ erga filium donũ est vt in nomine Iesu omne genu curuetur cœlestium terrestrium & infernorum.

Thirdly S. *Austin* expounds this place also litterally, of a corporall and outward bowing of the body. For speaking of *Iosephs* dreame *Gen.* 37. that his Father, Mother, and Brethren should bow downe to him, he applyeth this vnto Christ. But *Iosephs* brethren did properly and litterally bow downe to him, as we read *Gen.* 42. 6. therefore this proueth strongly that wee must litterally bow downe to Christ. And whereas S. *Austin* saith, that this

this bowing was not performed by his Father and Mother, for his Father did not bow, as being very old, and his mother could not be said to bow, being dead before, therefore S. *Austin* saith that this prophecy was not fulfilled in them, but in Christ, bringing in this place to the *Philip*. *Therefore in Christ his person, this place may be easily vnderstood euen of those that be dead according to that which the Apostle speaketh, because he hath giuen him a name aboue euery name, that at the name of* IESVS *every knee should be bowed, of things in heauen, of things in earth, and things vnder the earth.*

In Christi ergo persona facilem telligi potest etiã de mortuis, secũdum illud quod dicit Apost. Quia donauit ei nomen super omne nomen vt in nomen Iesu omne genu flectatur, cœlestium, terrestrium & infernorum: Phil 2. Aug. in Genes. quæst. 123

Fourthly *Theophilus Alexandrinus*, vpon these words, (*omne genu flectet*) saith, *this bowing is a signe or token of humble and earnest prayer*, if it be a token and outward signe, then hee takes bowing properly.

Solicitæ & humillimæ orationis indicium. Epist. Paschal.

Lastly *Anselme* taketh bowing of the knee here litterally, for vpon this place to the *Philip*. speaking of genuflection, he saith, *which is an euident signe of subiection*. If this bowing be a signe of subiection, then it is more then the thing signified, to wit, subiection it selfe.

Quod est euidens signum subiectionis.

The learned Bishop citeth two other auncient authors also, to this purpose, to wit, *Cyrill* and *Theodoret*.

The rest of the Fathers you bring, speake indeed, as I told you of subiection, though some of them bring in nothing but the bare words of this text, but expound them not. Others indeede expound them of the power and authority of Christ ouer all

creatures and their subiection to him, but by no words of theirs wee can gather that they exclude outward obeysance, therefore by good congruity we may, nay we ought to expound them to meane, what these others haue expressely declared, to wit, that by bowing the knee here, they would haue the outward seruice of the body, as well as that inward of the minde.

Thus we haue the consent of Fathers against you: and thus they will all very well agree together, otherwise they should be found to disagree. If some of them should say that by bowing of the knee here is meant only the subiection of the heart, others, the outward expression of bodily reverence also.

Where obserue by the way, to avoid all cauilling, that we speake not now about the name in the text for that is dispatched before, but now you know we are to examine, what is meant by bowing of the knee in the Text: and therefore I vrge these auncient authors and other new writers afterwards, onely to shew, what is the meaning of bowing the knee, whether it be to be vnderstood of an inward subiection of the heart only, as you would haue it, or of some outward obeysance also, ioyned with the inward, as I contend: And this is all that the learned Bishop intendeth, when he saith *there is no writer not of the ancient on this place that I can finde (saue he that turned all into allegories) but litterally vnderstands it, and likes well enough wee should actually performe it*, that is, they like well enough

that

that bowing of the knee ſhould here ſignify ſome outward reuerence, and externall geſture, as appeareth by thoſe authors he citeth.

But you will ſay what is this to the purpoſe for though bowing of the knee ſignify with theſe Fathers ſome externall reverence, yet none of theſe tell vs that this reuerence is to be done at the name of IESVS.

True, and therefore when I haue proued this, I haue not fully obtained what I deſire, for there ſtill remaines that queſtion, what is meant by the name, at which the text ſaith we ought to bow; which I hope is ſufficiently diſcuſſed before; yet if I can make it appeare that by bowing the knee here is meant ſome ſenſible expreſſion of bodily reuerence, then there is an open paſſage made to proue our cannon of the Church euen out of this text: But if you can proue either out of the Fathers, or by reaſon, and the coherence of the Text, that by bowing the knee the mentall ſubiection of the heart is here onely aimed at (as your notable full place ſeemeth to imply) I preſently yeeld; for then you haue ſtopt vp my way and paſſage, that I ſhall neuer be able to iuſtify the Canon of our Church out of this Text: ſeeing our Church commandeth a lowly reuerence, teſtifyed by ſome outward ceremony and geſture.

Therefore all that I ſtriue for is, that the Fathers by their expoſitions of this text, doe not croſſe and contradict that meaning, which our Church doth ſeeme to gather out of it.

In a word I labour not that the Fathers should be fully for me, but I hope to make good, that they are not against me, I desire in this matter to haue them lookers on.

To your notable full place I answere.

First, that it is not like to be St. *Ieroms* because as I shewed before out of the same father vpon *Isa.* 45. he saith, that the Christians doe vse to bow vnto Christ, and thereby are distinguished from the *Iewes*; so that he likes well enough of the bowing of the body, as well as the bowing of the mynde, and it is not likely hee would contradict himselfe, therefore our industrious censurer of the Fathers Mr. *Robert Cooke* doth shew that these commentaryes are not thought to be St. *Ieromes*.

Secondly it may be suspected, that these words here are taken out of *Origen hom.2. sup Iudic*: where are to be found, almost the very same words; so it seemes some orother, haue thrust them into *Ieroms* comentaryes; now *Origen* you know before was particularly excepted against by the *Bishop*.

Thirdly these words may beare a good construction, and not for you; for when he saith; that bowing the knee here doth [b] *not belong to the knees of the body but to the subiection of the soule*; his meaning is not, to exclude outward reuerence, as you may see afterwards, by words brought by you, *but vnderstanding this spiritually, I doe not by and by take away the custome of praying according to the letter, whereby we supplicate vnto God with a bended knee*. So that he would not haue the outward knee, without the

Censf: Patrum Pag. 143.

b *Non adgenua corporis sed ad subiectionem mentis pertinet.*

Hæc autem spiritualiter exponentes, non statim iuxta litteram orandi consuetudinẽ tollimus, quo deum genu posito supplicitev adoramus, & fixo in terram poplite, magis quod ab eo poscimus, impetramus. Legimus enim & paulum in littore sic orasse, & geniculationes in oratione Præceptas.

the inward; as he immediatly after advises; *as the outward obeysance doth edifie the simple; so we teach that true geniculation is in the soule; because many that bow their bodily knees, doe not for all this bow the knees of their soule: and on the other side; there bee others who praying vnto God, standing vpright, doe notwithstanding bow their minds and harts vnto God.*

Sicut illud edificat simplices sic veram geniculationem esse docemus in animo, quia multi corporale flectentes genu, animæ nequaquam popliteum curvaueruntur, & contra alii erecto deum corpore deprecantes magis se animo curvauerunt.

So that you may perceaue by this, that when this author saith, *non ad genua corporis pertinet it doth not belong to the knees of the body*, his meaning was, that it is not so to bee vnderstood of the knees of the body, as to thinke that sufficient, and so exclude the knees of the soule, but they must bow both together. And in this sense also, *Origen* himselfe, in the place before mentioned, may well be vnderstood that hee vtterly disliketh such outward bowing, which is not acompanyed with inward also. For there he saith, *what doth it profitt me, if I comming vnto God in prayer, I bow to him the knees of my body, and in the meane time bow the knees of my soule vnto the Devill.*

Quid mihi prodest si genua corporis mei ad orationem veniens flectam deo, & genua cordis flectam diabolo? Origen hom. 2. sup. Judic.

And this is no strange thinge, for the negatiue *non, not* to be put for *non tantum, not onely* both in the phrase of scripture and Fathers, I will giue one instance. *I will haue mercy* sayth the Lord *and not sacrifice*; what? thinke you, his intent in that place was vtterly to exclude sacrifice? No, but by this he would show how much he did preferre mercy before sacrifice, that if he could not haue them both, he had rather haue mercy and no sacrifice, then sacrifice and no mercy: so here; the bowing of the soule

Misericordiam volo & non sacrificium.

soule is so much to be preferred before the bowing of the body, that if they should once stande in competition; God will haue the bowing of the soule, and not that of the body: rather then the bowing of the body, without that of the soule, and in this sense St. *Ierom* might well call, *this bowing to bee bowing of the soule, not of the body.*

So that the reuerend and learned *Bishop* might well say, there is no writer not of the ancient on this place saueing hee that turned all into allegoryes that is *Origen* who you see also, may haue a good construction) but litterally vnderstands bowing here, and likes well enough that wee should actually performe it.

So much concerning auncient writers vpon this bowing. Come wee now to your latter writers, and let vs see, what they thinke of this genuflexion.

You vrge *Salmeron* to bee on your side, and yet hee expounds this bowing litterally, of an outward bowing, for hee saith, [a] *that they may bestowe divine honour vpon Christ which honor by a synechdoche is expressed by* genuflection.

You might as well haue let alone *Estius*, who saith thus out of *Vincentius* de *Valentia*; [b] *after the auncient custome of the Christians onely to the name of* IESVS *wee doe some reuerence when it is named.* To as little purpose you vrge *Zanchy*, who vpon this place is also flatly against you. [c] *From hence I doubt not saith he, sprung that most auncient custome in the Churches, that when* IESVS *is named, all vn-*

couer

a *Vt diuinum honorem impendant Christo qui per synechdocben exprimitur in genuflectione.*

b *Veteri Christianorum more soli nomini Iesu quando nominatur reuerentia fit.*

c *Hinc non dubito quin profecta sit illa antiquissima consuetudo in ecclesiis vt cum nominatur Iesus omnes aperiant caput in testimonium reverentiæ & adorationis.*

couer their heads in testimony of reuerence and adoration.

You might also haue spared *Musculus* who is very punctuall on our side. *That which the Apostle here speaketh belongeth to the worship of Christ, which he expresseth here by genuflection, as an outward honour indeede, yet a witnesse of inward reverence and adoration.*

Ad illius adorationē pertinet quæ hic dicit quam per genuflectionem exprimit, tanquam externum quidē cultum verum interne reuerentiæ & adorationis testem.

Peter Martyr makes as little for you, *neither is genuflection here*, saith he, *any thing else, then a kind of lowlinesse which is fitly signified by this outward signe.*

Neq; aliud hic est genuflectio quam demissio quæ externo symbolo aptissime significatur. In Ep. ad Rom. cap. 14.

What made you vrge Dr. *Bois?* whom before you confessed to be against you, as well as *Zanchy*, for he is plaine enough on our side: *The name Iesus signifieth a sauiour: worthily therefore*, saith he, *hath the Church prescribed that wee rise vp and bend our knees to his sauing name: But this we doe not because of the syllables compounded, but because of the salvation expounded by this divine power, reverencing his maiesty, and giuing thankes unto him for the saluation bestowed vpon vs, by this sacred name; for this is the name aboue euery name at which every knee shall bow, of things in heauen, things in earth, things vnder the earth.* Phil. 2. 10.

Nomen Iesu saluatorem significat ideoq; merito quidem ex ecclesiæ instituto ad hoc salutare nomen assurgimus & genuflectimus. At hoc non ad syllabicam compositionem sed ad saluificam expositionem divini numinis &c

Hoc siquidem nomen est supra omne nomen ad quod omne genu flectatur, &c. Phil. 2. 10.

The like he hath in another place, vpon these words of the *Phil. euery knee shall bow. That contemptible name* IESVS *as Pilate scoffingly*, Iesus Nazarenus Rex Iudeorum, *is now preached and praised as that it is a name farr aboue all names: hence capping and kneeling in the Church at the name* IESVS

D Bois Sund. aft. Christ. Gospell.

an harmelesse yet not fruitlesse ceremony; which may be well vsed and not to be misliked; as being a reverend regard to the sonne of God aboue other messengers, although speaking as from God: and against Infidells, Iewes, & Arrians, who derogate from the honour of IESVS, *a respect most profitable.* And a little after.

Sunday next before Easter Epistle.

Therefore the condemning of this honour done to IESVS *in the Church, is an argument of spight, rather then an euidence of the spirit.*

But of all the rest I wonder you will vrge *Calvin* to be for you, who in three severall places doth so plainely and fully ouerthrow your inward bowing and subiection of the heart only, as if he had purposely wrot against you. As first vpon *Isa.* 45. 23. (*euery knee shall bow to me*) he hath these words, *the Prophet hath sett downe the worship it selfe by the signe of it, as it is often done, from whence wee may obserue, that euen outward worship also is required of God. For the Prophet doth not seuer the outward profession of religion, from the inward affection of the mind. In vaine therefore some frantick spirits boast, that they worship God, when as they prostrate themselues before Idolls; in vaine, I say, doe they pretend that their mind is right towards God, because the inward worship of the mind cannot be seuered from an outward profession of the same.*

Rem a signo notauit vt sæpius fieri solet. Vnde obseruandum est externum etiam cultum requiri a Deo nec enim propheta externam professionem religionis ab interiori animi affectu disiungit, frustra igitur fanatici quidam se deum colere & venerari iactant, dum coram idolis se prosternunt frustra inquam obtendunt mentem suam in Deum erectum esse quoniam animi cultus ab externa professione diuidi non potest.

Secondly vpon those words of the Apostle *Rom.* 14. 11. (*euery knee shall bow to me*) he saith, [b] *Our Lord would plainely declare, that all men shall not onely*

b *Voluit Dominus simpliciter affirmare cunctos homines non agituros suum nomen, sed confessione obedientiæ edituros & ore & externo corporis gestu quem per genuflectionem designauit.*

acknow-

acknowledge his Deity, but also that they shall shew a confession of their obedience, both in tongue, and outward gesture of the body, which is decyphered by genuflection.

Lastly vpon these words to the *Philip.* he saith, *although by this kind of gesture to wit of bowing wee doe reuerence to men, yet there is no doubt but adoration here spoken of belongs properly to God, a signe or token whereof is genuflection: wherein we may obserue that God is to be worshipped if we will giue him his owne, not onely with the inward affection of the heart but in the outward profession of the body. Therefore on the other side, when God will decypher out his true worshippers, he saith, that they haue not bowed the knee before the Image of* Baall.

Adoratio hic notatur quæ est Dei propria cuius symbolum est genuflectio in quo obseruare conuenit non interiori modo cordis affectu, sed externa quoque professione Deum colendum esse si uelimus Deo reddere quod suum est, itaq; e conuerso cum vult Deus designare legitimos suos cultores dicit eos non flexisse genu coram imagine Baal. 1. King. 19. 18.

Adde vnto these that of *Piscator* in his observations vpon this Text.[b] *Concerning the ceremony of genuflection when the name of* IESVS *is pronounced: the occasion of this ceremony, seemeth to be taken out of this place, where* Paul *saith, there is such a name giuen to Christ, that at the name of* IESVS *euery knee should bow. But the mind of Saint* Paul *is not, that so often as the name of* IESVS *is pronounced, the knee ought to bow as though the very name were of such worship, but by name he vnderstandeth glory, at the acknowledgement of which glory, he would haue all reverence and honour yeelded vnto Christ, which hee notes out by genuflection, by which rite or ceremony*

b *De ceremonia genuflectionis cum pronunciatur nomen* Iesus *videtur huius ceremonia occasio sumpta ex hoc loco vbi dicit Paulus Christo donatum esse tale nomen vt in nomine* Iesu *se flectat omne genu, sed mens Paulinen est quod quoties pronunciatur nomen* Iesu *genu flecti debeat, quasi ipsum illum nomen tantæ sit dignitatis, sed per nomen intelligit gloriam cuius gloriæ agnitione vult Christo exhiberi omnem reverentiam & cultum quem notat per genuflectionem quo ritu reverentia exhiberi solet.*

reuerence is commonly shewed.

Where obserue that although *Piscator* would not haue the name here to be the bare name of IESVS, yet he will haue bowing the knee here to be taken for an outward expression of reverence, and moreover that our custome of bowing the knee at the name of IESVS, is occasioned by those words of the Apostle.

Many other new writers I haue brought before to be for this bowing as you may see pag. 20. &c.

So that what the learned Bishop saith of the old writers, I may also say of the new: there is no writer of them on this place as I can finde (sauing hee that was knowne to be an open disturber of the Church, in this and many other points) but litterally vnderstands bowing the knee here; and will haue vs by a sensible demonstration and outward gesture of the body, declare our inward humility and obedience of heart and soule.

Cartwright.

Append.

For first, that bowing at the name Iesus, is an actuall corporall bowing, peculiar vnto men who haue knees to bow: this in the Text, a metaphoricall bowing, which Angells and Spirits that haue no knees to bow with, yeeld to Christ as well as men.

Answere.

Though Angells and spirits haue no knees, as we haue, yet haue they that whereby they expresse their

their inward subiection, by some outward and visible gesture, such as their nature is capable of, which is to them insteede of knees; for as I told you before, bowing the knee here is put for any kind of outward gesture of reuerence and subiection, which agreeth as well to Angells and spirits that haue no knee, as to men who haue knees; for men expresse it by the knee, those by some other way, answerable to the knee.

Appendix.

Secondly, that is a bowing of veneration, or adoration rather: this of the Text, a bowing onely of subiection:

Answere.

It is true in those that willingly bow, their subiection is no adoration, but in good Christians, who yeeld their obedience with a willing knee, their subiection is adoration and veneration; but the text is vnderstood of both, as before is declared.

Appendix

Thirdly, that is a bowing only of liuing men; this of Angells, Divels, and soules departed:

Answer.

I say this bowing in the text is verified now, not onely in liuing men, but in good Angels and blessed soules departed, but at the last day shall be fulfilled in all sorts both good and bad.

Append.

That onely of Christians in the Church: this both of Christians, in, of Infidels, Iewes and Pagans out of the Church:

Answere.

This proueth no more, but that this Text is a fulfilling now, because some begin to bow already; but it is not perfectly accomplished till the last day, when Iewes, Infidells, Pagans, and all must bow whether they will or no.

Appendix.

That onely of some few Christians; and those for the most part *Papists, ignorant, or superstitious persons*, who are most zealous of it: This of all: of all the Prophets, Patriarkes, and *Saints* before Christs time; of all the Apostles and Christians in Christs time; of all the Fathers and Christians in the primitiue Church, (who were neuer acquainted with this new-coyned duty of bowing at the name Iesus;) of all the Protestants and reformed Churches beyond the seas, (who not only in their constant practise, *but in their iudgements too, reiect this as a Papish, idle, superstitious Nouelty*;) as well as any others.

Answer.

This bowing you say is of a few Christians; It is true, and it is pitty there be no more that will bow; if you might haue your mind there should fewer bow then doe, but I hope to see more bow then e-

uer

uer did, not of ignorant Papists, and superstitious persons, as you call them, but better protestants, freer from superstition, and farre more learned then your selfe; but it is your fashion to brand all those with ignorance or superstition, that iumpe not with you in your conceits.

Againe who denyes, but that all of all sorts shall bow at the last day, which is the fulfilling of this prophecy, what then? doth the text intend that none should bow in the meane time? yes surely, though this text be verified of euery knee *then*, yet should it be true of some knees *now*, that they must bow at the name of IESVS; for all prophecies are not fulfilled on a sudden, but by degrees, as *Caluin* doth well obserue vpon this text.

Append.

Fourthly, that a bowing only at the name, this to the person, power, and supreame authority of the Lord Iesus Christ. That a bowing in the house of God in this life; this a bowing before Christs Tribunall in the day of iudgement; and that onely at the sight of the person, the apprehension of the Maiestie, power and Dominion of Iesus Christ; not at the bare sound or Eccho of his name; for no man (I dare auerre) can euer proue, that Angels, Devils, or soules departed, doe either now, or hereafter shall in the day of iudgement, actually bow or cringe at euery recall of the name Iesus.

Answere.

Who euer vrged or practised bowing at the name secluding the person; for you must not thinke

vs

vs so silly to teach, or others so simple as to beleeue, that they must bow to the bare name, without reference to the person; for as I must not seuer my outward worship from my inward, so neither must I divide his name from his person: for as the outward without the inward is meere dissimilation, so to honour the name without the person is worse then superstition: but as the learned Bishop hath it, we bow not to the sound of the syllables, but to the sense of the name, or as Dr *Bois* hath it, *not to the syllabicall composition, but to the saluificall exposition of this divine power*; wee bow to this name IESVS, as it hath immediate reference to the person of Christ, or wee bow to his person, as it hath relation to this name; I bowe vnto Christ as he is a IESVS: and I hope you will not say, but a name in reference to a person is capable both of honour and dishonour; else in vaine were the third commandement, *thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vaine*: there, a name is capable of dishonour, here of honour.

Non ad syllabicam compositionem sed ad saluificam expositionem. Sunday after Christmas vp on the Gospel

Besides the bowing now in the house of God, and hereafter before his tribunall, are not opposite, but both may be done in their due times, and both comprehended in the Text; true this bowing cannot be now at the sight of Christs person; for that hath long agoe beene taken away from vs, onely he hath left his name behind him; that we may shew our reuerence and respect vnto it, *for holy and reverent is his name*, Psal. 111. 9.

Appendix.

Lastly, that a particular bowing of the knee of some privatemen onely, without any concurrent confession of the tongue, *that Iesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father*, both which are coupled together in the Text; this a vniversall ioynt subiection or bowing of the knee of all Angels, Men, and Deuils vnto Christ, accompanied with an open attestation and confession of their tongues, *that Iesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father*. This bowing therefore of the head heart or knee, at the name of Iesus, which so much differs from the Apostles bowing in this obiected Scripture, is not the bowing expressed, much lesse intended by the Apostle in this Text: Wherefore I may infallibly conclude, that it is not, yea that it cannot be a duty of the Text; (*much lesse a duty of that necessity, the omission, or neglect of which abolisheth all Religion, all honour, reverence and feare of God and Christ, and makes men in a manner Atheists:*) as the first Patriots, and propugners of it doe affirme.

Answere.

This bowing of the knee, which the Church commandeth to be done in publique, to wit, in time of divine seruice, is not with out confession of the tongue, for then I am sure wee doe often acknowledge that IESVS is the LORD. This bowing therefore of the head, or knee or body at the name of IESVS, which we vse, doth not so much differ from the Apostles bowing, but that they may well stand together: which though it be not primarily intended by the Apostle, who speakes of generall bowing of all at the last day; yet is it secondarily intima-

ted in these words, and the beginning vnto that vniversall bowing. Wherefore I may infallibly conclude, that our bowing at the name of IESVS, is a ceremonious duty gathered directly from that text; and those that will take liberty to pervert that text at their pleasure, and to violate a direct canon of our Church for bowing, grounded no doubt vpon that text, do make an open way to irreuerence, irreligion, disorder, and confusion.

Secondly

Append.

SEcondly, as it is no duty of the Text, so neither is it a Ceremony, much lesse an arbitrary, innocent, commendable, orderly, or decent Ceremony, as the latter Advocates, and Champions of it doe publish to the world: Not a meere or proper Ceremony. First, because it is no adiunct, no Appendix to, no forme or circumstance of any religious duty whatsoeuer, as *all Ceremonies are.*

Answere.

YOV haue done with your first generall part, and hauing proved, as well as you can, that it is no duty of the text; now you proceede, and will make vs beleeue that it is so farre from being a duty of the text, that it is not a ceremony to be endured: And first, because it is no adiunct or circumstance of a religious duty.

I haue told you long agoe that this bowing is not the religious duty it selfe of reuerence and subiection, but only a signe of it, as Mr *Calvin* hath well obserued: *adoration is here noted vnto vs, which is*

proper vnto God: whose signe or token is genuflection: for if that be true of *Seneca*, *that there is great difference betweene the matter of a benefit, and the benefit it selfe, that the benefit consisteth not in that which is done or giuen, but in the very minde or intention of him that doth, or giueth it. So that that which you looke vpon is not the benefit, but a signe or token of the benefit*, much more is it true here, that the bowing of the knee is not the adoration or reverence it selfe, but onely an outward signe of it; the duty it selfe consists in the heart. So then this bowing of the knee is a signe, and hath immediat reference to the inward humility and thankefulnesse of the heart; and both to Christ, as he is IESVS.

Multum interest inter materiam beneficii & beneficium: non in eo, qd fit aut datur, consistit, sed in ipso dantis aut facientis animo, sic non est beneficium id qd suboculis venit sed beneficii vestigium & nota De Benef. lib. 1. cap. 5. & 6.

Appendix.

Secondly, because it hath an immediate reference to the very person of Christ himselfe both God and man, not to the sound or Syllables of his name Iesus, to which this bowing is not due, not yeelded, as *those who plead for it doe acknowledge*. Now no meere, no proper ceremony whatsoeuer, hath any immediat independent relation to the very person or Deity of Christ: but onely to some sacred ordinance, or religious duty to which it is appendant; as kneeling, to prayer; standing to the Creed: other such Ceremonies, to the administration of the Sacraments, and Liturgie of the Church: Therefore it is no Ceremony, because it hath an immediat relation vnto Christ himselfe.

Answere.

You consider not, that bowing of the knee lookes two manner of wayes; before it, and behind it; as it lookes

lookes forward indeede to the obiect, to whom it is directed, it hath immediate relation to Christ himselfe: but as it lookes backward to the cause, from whence it proceedeth, it hath relation to the humble hart and soule of man: and thus it is a signe and ceremony of that obeysance and subiection and thankefulnes I owe vnto my saviour: so that as standing to the Creede, aud bowing to prayer, so hath bowing of the knee relation to the inward subiection of the hart. It is not then a ceremony in respect of the obiect, but in respect of the cause. And it is well, you will confesse the trueth here, that those who vrge it will not haue it to the sound or syllables of his name, but to the very person of Christ.

Appendix.

Thirdly, because the arguments that are produced to proue it, to bee a necessary or laudable Ceremony, doe directly proue it to be no Ceremony, but a Divine worship or adoration peculiar vnto Christ as God. The first argument that is pressed, to enforce, and presse this Ceremony on mens consciences as a thing approued, or rather commanded by Diuine authority, is *the very letter and syllables of Phil:* 2. 9.10. But this argument proues it to be a duty incident to the very name and person of Iesus; and so no naked arbitrary Ceremony.

Answere.

I haue told you before that it is a duty of the text, and yet not such a duty which hinders it from being a ceremony: for euery duty which the text

commandeth vs, is not morall and substantiall, but there bee some ceremoniall and circumstantiall dutyes which belong to Gods worship, of which sort is that, as I haue told you before, concerning being vncouered in the Church; No man will deny, but this is a duty of the text, as well as a Canon of the Church, and yet who knowes not, but that this is a meere ceremony, and belongs not to the substance of Gods seruice.

Appendix.

The 2d. thing alleaged for this genuflecting Ceremony, to cleare it from the danger of superstition, and idolatry, is this *that it is done immediately to the person, not to the bare name of Iesus*, though some are so absurd, as to produce many fond, Cabalisticall, ridiculous, fantastique reasons, from the very letters and syllables of the name Iesus, why men should bow at it alone, rather then at any other names of Christ; which reasons I count folly, or frensie rather for to answere: If then it be a bowing either onely or immediatly to the person of Christ, it is doubtlesse then no Ceremony, but a Divine worship, or wit-worship rather, since no Scripture doth command it.

Answere.

You brought this argument immediatly before, and therefore you must haue the same immediate answere, that as bowing in prayer, so bowing here at the name of IESVS, if you respect his obiect to whom it is done, hath immediate relation to God; but if you respect the cause of it, from whence it proceeds,

proceeds, then it hath relation to the inward bowing of the hart, and of this, and in this respect it is a ceremony and outward signe; I count those as fond as you doe who bring reasons from the very words and letters of the name, to prooue we should bow vnto it.

Appendix.

The third and in truth the maine and onely plea produced for this Ceremony is this; *that it was at first taken vp inioyned by the primitiue, and as yet continued by the moderne Church, to iustifie, testifie, and proclaime the Deity of Christ against Arrians, Iewes, and Infidels that denyed it.* Which reason, as it is meerely forged; there being not one Father or authentique auncient Writer this day extant, to proue, that this bowing at the name of Iesus was euer vsed in the primitiue Church, which questionlesse did not entertaine it, since we finde no mention, *no footstepts of it in* any one ancient Author; and since the constant Exposition that all the fore-recited Fathers and ancient Authors giue of Phil. 2.9. 10 Isay.45.23. Rom.14.11. doth seeme to contradict it. As it might haue yeelded a sufficient argument to *Eunomius, Macedonius, Samosatenus, Photinus, and their Followers,* (who denied the Deity of the holy Ghost, in the primitiue times, as the Greekes and other Heretiques haue done since,) to proue that the holy Ghost is not God, because men bow not at the recitall of his name: a sufficient reason to disproue the vse of this bowing at the name of Iesus in the primitiue Church to testify the Deity of Christ, since as many or more did then deny the Deity of the holy Ghost, as of Christ, at whose name none euer bowed that we read off. As it necessarily infers, that men must bow at every recitall of the holy Ghost his name, as well as at the mention of the same Iesus: yea at every name of Iesus Christ as well

as

as at any: since Heretiques, Iewes, Infidels, haue alike denied both their Deities, yea the Deity of Christ expressed by any of his names, as well as by his name Iesus. As it ceaseth now to bee a reason in all protestant Churches, because none of them doe now openly deny the eternall deity of Christ, as *Iewes and Arrians* did. So it directly proues this to bee no Ceremony no veneration, or will worship commnicable to any name or creature whatsoeuer: but a Diuine adoration peculiar vnto Christ, as the second person in the Trinity both God and man. For it being such a bowing, (as is confessed) that doth manifest, iustifie, and proclaime the Deity of Christ against Arrians, Iewes, and Infidels, who deny it, it must needs bee a bowing aboue all bowing that is either due, or giuen vnto men: a bowing that is due and proper vnto God onely: else it cannot manifest or declare Christ Iesus to bee God. And if such a bowing: then doubtlesse a Divine worship or adoration, which no humane Constitutions can prescribe: not a meere formall Ceremony, as some pretend.

Answere.

This might well be one, though not the onely reason of bowing at the name of IESVS; and good reason there was, why they should bow at this name of Christ, rather then any other, to testifie his deity, because this name IESVS was a dying and suffering name, and therefore of all names, they could not be perswaded, that a dying man should be a God: yet good Christians would testifie by their submission to this name, that hee who suffered and dyed was God as well as man.

But then, say you, they should haue bowed to the name of the *Holy-Ghost* too, because as many if not more denyed his deity.

But

But you are mistaken sir, for those hereticks denyed not the deity of the *Holy Ghost* directly, but by a consequence; because they first denyed the deity of the sonne, and so thought him to be a creature; therefore they could not choose but imagin the *Holy Ghost* to be a creature also, because hee proceeded from the sonne. So that if I mistake not, none of those ancient hereticks denyed the deity of the *Holy Ghost*, but such as first had denyed the deity of the Sonne, as *Epiphanius* speaketh of some of them, *but these* (saith he) *affirme that the Holy-Ghost, is a creature proceeding from a creature*. So that those Christians who by shewing reuerence to the name of IESVS, did acknowledg the deity of the Sonne; did by a consequence also vindicate and prooue the *Holy Ghost* to be God, seeing nothing can proceede from the essence or substance of God. but that which is God.

ὅτι δὲ βέλονται αὐτὸ εἶναι κτίσμα κτίσματος. *Epiph. heres.* 69. Num. 18. *edit. græcolat. Paris.* 1622.

But you tell vs that not only *Eunomius* and other Heretiques in the Primitiue times denyed the deity of the Holy Ghost, but the Greeks and others haue done since.

Here you shew your selfe a proper divine, for who ever before you imputed so foule a crime to those poore Greeks? For had you read any of their writings, yea or those that haue written against them, you could not be ignorant, but that they maintayne the deity of the holy Ghost, as firmely and orthodoxly as your selfe. I know not what you meane by it, I hope I shall in your reply, vnlesse you ayme at their opinion concerning the procession of

the holy Ghost. They say indeed; that the *Holy Ghost* proceedeth from the father only; what then? this is no disparagement to the deity of the *Holy Ghost*; all the wrong, if there be any, is done vnto the sonne, by denying him this priuiledge of producing the *Holy-Ghost*. For the *Holy Ghost* is as truely and fully God, though he doe proceede from the Father alone, as the Sonne, who is begotten by the Father alone.

But here, as in diuers other conclusions, you ioyne hands with those whom you would seeme most of all to decline. I meane the Iesuits and Pontificians of Rome who yet speake not so ill of them, as you doe; for though they call them hereticks in this point yet they say not that the Grecians deny the deity of the *holy Ghost*. What is to be thought of their opinion, concerning the procession of the *Holy Ghost*, I may peradventure haue occasion one day more fully to declare. And I am perswaded that vpon due examination, they will not be found to deny the deity of the *Holy Ghost*, as you rashly conceaue, no nor yet scarce to be in an error, I am sure our most iudicious reformed writers are very charitable towards them in this point and I would wish you to haue a better opinion of them, till you know their opinion better.

Lastly, you take the outward reuerence for the inward worship: I haue often enough told you, that bowing is but a signe of that diuine adoration wee owe vnto God; and so being a signe it may be, nay it must be a ceremony: nether did I ever tell you that this

this bowing was an humane constitution for I hope the Church may make lawes for the more strict keeping of those things which are commanded even in the word of God, as it doth of being vncouered in divine service.

Append.

But admit it be a Ceremony, yet certainely it is no arbitrary, harmelesse, laudable, decent, orderly Ceremony as is pretended. Not an arbitrary Ceremony, *which no man is constrained* to vse, as Mr. *Hooker*, and others write: since many are vrged, if not enioyned for to vse it: others questioned, if not censured for oppugning it.

Answere.

True it is, that in Mr. *Hookers* time no man was constrayned to vse it, neither yet doe I perceaue any called in question for neglecting it; yet men may bee complayned of, if they should obstinately and wilfully breake this canon of the Church, and there might bee a punishment inflicted vpon them, for transgressing such an ordinance.

For considering the Church hath thus declared her selfe in it, men may be made to vse it, and censured for oppugning it.

For were it thus in it selfe neuer so indifferent, yet seeing the Church hath enioyned it; it is not for you, and such as you are, to plead your Christian liberty, and frame reasons against it at your pleasure; but humbly to submit your selfe to the Churches authority: for although, not to bow at this name,

were no fault in it selfe, yet being thus commanded by lawfull authority, disobedience is a great sinne, euen as the sinne of witch-craft.

Appendix.

Not an harmelesse Ceremony. First in that it occasions much Idolatry, not only in *Papists*, but in ignorant Protestants: if not in adoring the person of Iesus, *in this name Iesu, in the selfe same manner as the Papists doe adore it in their Images, Altars, Hoasts, Crosses, & crucifixes*; which we count Idolatry: yet at least wise, in worshipping the very naked name of Iesus, without any reference to his person, or else with reference to *Ioshua, Iustus, or the sonne of Syrach, enstyled by the name of Iesus in the* Scripture, at the reading of whose name Iesus almost as many bow, as at the name of Iesus Christ, being deceaued by the identity of the word.

Answere.

It is no Idolatry, nor yet any iust occasion of Idolatry, to worship the person of IESVS in or at his name; for this name IESVS doth giue vs a liuely resemblance of him, and not of his person onely, but of his person together with this comfortable relation of sauing vs, and had the Papists as good ground out of Scripture for their reuerence to Images, &c. as we haue, for this bowing at the name of IESVS, we might as safely ioyne with them in those, as in this.

And what though some worship the name without reference to the person, and doe bow vnawares vnto IESVS, when as Iustus or the sonne of *Syrach* is

is meant; must we therefore take away this devoute ceremony, because some doe abuse it? no, keepe still the custome, and teach them how to vse it better; and yet for ought I know there is none so blind and ignorant amongst vs, to bow to this naked name, without reference to the person of Christ. For as the learned Bishop saith well and in a word, we bow to the sense not to the sound,

Appendix

Secondly, in that it occasioneth *much palpable superstition*; by bowing at the name Iesus only, not at the name *of God the Father, God the holy Ghost, God, Emmanuel, Lord, Iehouah, Sauiour, Sonne of God, Lambe of God, Christ, Mediator*, and the like, *all glorious reuerend, holy, great and fearfull names*, deseruing as much bowing and reuerence as the name Iesus doth.

Answere.

There can be no iust cause of superstition to doe as God commandeth vs; for had he commanded vs to bow to any of those names you mention; wee ought to haue done it, as well as to this; and why he commandeth reuerence to this name, rather then to others, I haue giuen you reasons before; for although all these names deserue at our hands much reuerence and submission; yet they deserue not so much thankes and humble acknowledgement of favour done vnto vs, as this name IESVS: for these names are most of them names of power, maiesty, and glory; but the name that we glory in, is a name of mercy, tender compassion, and commiseration;

it is a name of such loue and fauour, as neuer the like was shewne, for greater loue then this is not vsuall, that one should dye for his friend; but loe Christ dyed for vs, when we were his enimies. And all this was done for vs by IESVS, not by him, as he was the sonne of God, or Lord of Lords, or a mighty Prince, or King of Kings; but as he was a IESVS, and therefore to this name doe wee owe so much reuerence and thankefull duty.

Append.

Thirdly, in that *it makes a kind of disparity in the sacred persons of the Trinity*, who are coeternall, and coequall, in advancing the sonne aboue the Father, or the holy Ghost in yeelding, in attributing more honour, worship and reverence to the name and of one of them then to the other two:

Answer.

Something you say, had we done this reuerence to IESVS of our owne heads, without any warrant from God, but I hope Sir that which we doe at the commandement of God the Father, is no disparagement or dishonour vnto God the Father: Now the Father, as the text saith, both gaue him this name, and also would haue vs to bow vnto it: so that although this bowing be vnto IESVS, yet it is done at the Fathers command, and he is therein honoured, in that we obey his commandement: you know that *Nabuchadnezar* commanded more honour to be done to the Image, then to himselfe. Yet this honour done to the Image, he thought no

dishonour

dishonour to himselfe, but rather a greater glorie, that men would yeeld so farre at his command: much more will God the Father thinke himselfe honoured, if we fall downe to his liuely Image, euen his deare sonne our blessed sauiour. And to goe no further, this is our Apostles inference here in the Text that euery knee should bow to his name, and euery tongue should confesse that *Iesus Christ* is Lord. Why? To what end? Euen *to the glory of God the Father:* So that this bowing of the knee, and this confession of the tongue, though they bee both done vnto the sonne, yet doe they both redounde to the glory of God the father; and thus St *Chrisostome*, besides many other vpon this text, saith, *thou seest euery where that the Father is glorified when the sonne is glorified, so likewise the Father is dishonoured when the Sonne is dishonoured, the honour or dishonour of the Sonne reacheth vnto the Father.* Great difference then betweene Saint *Paules* and Mr *Prinnes* inference, Saint *Paul* saith that this bowing at the name of IESVS is to the honour and *glory of God the Father*: but Mr *Prinne* saith, it is the dishonour and disglory of God the Father, which will yee belieue?

εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ πατρός.

Vides vbiq; glorificari patrem dum filius glorificatur: ita & pater dehonestatur quando dehonestatur filius, in patrem pertingit filii seu honor seu ignominia.

And here we must be wary how we compare the name IESVS, with the name *Iehovah* of God the Father, for though indeede in respect of vs, and of our saluation, it is the name IESVS that wee glory in, that we admire; yet to speake absolutely, wee must take heede of preferring the name of the Sonne aboue the name of the Father. For when the Father,

gaue

gaue him a name aboue euery name, the meaning is, that he gaue him a name aboue euery creature, whether men or Angells: here is no comparison with the names of the other persons, yea the name of the Father is herein to be excepted: for as the Apostle saith else where, that the Father *hath put all things vnder the sonnes feete*; you must not, you cannot therefore conclude, that the Father himselfe is put vnder his feete; for the Apostle doth presently answere such an obiection, *but when hee saith all things are put vnder him, it is manifest that he is excepted that did put all things vnder him.* So here, when the Father hath giuen Christ a name aboue euery name, the meaning cannot be, that hee hath giuen him a name aboue his owne name; & though this exception be not here set downe, yet it must be vnderstood, that when he saith, he gaue him a name aboue euery name, it is manifest that *His* name is excepted who gaue him that name; and it was *Musculus* his good hap to light vpon this exception, for vpon the words *he gaue him a name aboue euery name*, he saith, *to wit excepting the name of God the Father, from whom he receiued the excellency of his name.*

1 Cor. 15. 27.

Vtiq; excepto nomine Dei Patris a quo omnis excellentiam accepit.

Nomen Jesu est maius, sanctius & venerabilius, &c.

Deus significat Deum qua dominus & creator est, Iesus vero significat Deum qua salvator & redemptor, &c.

Therefore, for my part, I will vtterly dislike that comparison of *Cornelius a Lapide* vpon these words, *the name* IESVS, saith he, *is greater, holyer & more to be adored then that ineffable name Iehouah.* One of his reasons is this, *because the name God or Iehovah signifieth but a Creator, but* IESVS *noteth vnto vs a redeemer*; Now the worke of redempti-

on

on is greater and more beneficiall to vs then that of creation.

But he considers not, that these works are not proper to these persons but common, for as the Father did not create without the Sonne, no more did the Sonne redeeme vs, without the father: for though this worke of our redemption was acted by the second person, yet was it done by the furtherance and good likeing of them all: and though this be true of the sonne, that he gaue himselfe a ransome for many; and greater loue then this could not bee, showne that hee should lay downe his life for vs; what then? did not the loue also of the Father appeare euen in this our redemption? yea so great loue, that the Apostle is not able to expresse it: for *so*, hee cannot tell you how much, but *so*, *God* the Father *loued the world that hee gaue his onely begotten Sonne for vs:* so that the Father hath an especiall hand in our redemprion as well as the Sonne. Iohn.3.16.

Another reason of *Cornelius* a *Lapide* that IESVS is to be preferred before *Iehovah* is, because *Iehovah was the conqueror and ouercommer of Pharaoh and the Egiptians, but* IESVS *is the vanquisher of hell and the Devill: Iehovah was the lawgiuer of the Iewes and the old testament,* IESVS *of the Christians and the new testament; Iehovah led the Hebrewes through the red Sea into the land of Canaan,* IESVS *by his blood whereby wee are washed and baptized, leadeth vs into heaven.* *Iehovah fuit contritor & debellat r Pharaonis & Aegypti Iesus contritor est diaboli & inferni. &c.*

Here is strange diuinity; as if *Iehovah* God the Father did belong onely to the old testament, and

that we haue no neede, no benefite of him now: what is the Father now become a type of the sonne, and so expires and ceases to bee of any vse when the sonne is come? I had thought that *Moses* in giuing the law, and in ouerthrowing the *Egyptians*, had beene the type of Christ, not God the Father: and must our deliuerance from Hell and Sathan, and our admittance into Heauen be so peculiar to the Sonne, that *Iehovah* shall haue no hand in them, for thus the *Iesuite* must meane, if his comparison hold; our blessed Saviour attributes no such thing to himselfe, but alwayes ascribed all to the Father; how doe we read in the gospell, *I came not of my selfe, It is my Father which sent me*, and when he was about that great worke of our salvation; *Father if it bee possible and not my will, but thy will bee done.* Let him take heede least, avoiding the sinne of the Arian, who made the sonne inferiour to the Father, hee runne not into as great a crime, in exalting the sonne aboue the Father. Though *Bellarmine* tells vs, and he saith true, that there was no danger heretofore of erring on that hand, for all the auncient heretiques did runne into the other extreame, by taking too much from the Sonne, and most amongst them denyed the Deity of the Sonne, but wee shall scarce read of any that denyed the deity of the Father.

lib. 1. *de Christo* cap. 4.

Another reason of the Iesuites is because, as he saith, *the name* IESVS *contaynes in it all the letters of the name Iehovah, and adds something to it, so that Iehovah is but as it were the ænigma of* IESVS, *and*

Nomen Iehovah quod idem est cum nomine Iesu includit literas omnes nominis Jehovah &c.

IESVS

IESVS the declaration of this name Iehovah.

If this were so as he sayes it were but a small reason, yet this is not true, for this ה which is doubled in *Iehovah* is not at all in the name IESVS, indeede *Iehoshuah* containes in it more of the letters of *Iehovah*, but there is difference betweene *Iehoshua* and *Ioshuah*, for the one signifieth a saviour, the other that God will saue. For the truth is that IESVS cometh of the Hebrew word ישע which signifyeth to saue, though some Greeke Fathers not willing to goe beyond their owne language, would faine deriue it from a Greeke word, which signifieth to cure or heale; which though it be no true derivation of his name, yet is a very good allusion to his nature, for he alone is the true Physician of our soules.

Of iesuai sano as if IESVS were the same with *iatros medicus* so *Epiphan. her*: 29. *Basil*. in *ascet*. *Cyrill. catechis.* 10.

His last reason is taken from our custome of bowing the head and knee at the name IESVS and not at the name *Iehovah*.

But I haue answered before, that we doe this, because that God the Father will haue it so; if the King should command all to putt off their hatts, when they here this name, *the Prince*, and yet not to put off, when they heare this name *the King*: would any conclude from hence that the Prince is more to bee honoured, then the King; not considering in the meanetyme, that this very honor, which is done to the Prince, is performed at the Kings command, and for his sake; And this may bee one reason why the Father would haue vs bow at the name of IESVS, because he is to iudge both the quicke and the dead;

Ios.5.22. for *the father iudgeth no man but hath committed all iudgement to the sonne*. The *Iesuite* might farre better argue from hence that the sonne is to be honoured more then the Father, because he alone is to be iudge, and not the Father: but the same answere serueth for all, that this power and authority of iudging comes euen from the Father, for so saith the text, *he hath committed all iudgement to the Sonne*.

Appendix.

Fourthly, *in preferring one name of Christ, aboue another*; to wit, his name Iesus aboue all his other names and titles, which haue as neere a relation, as great a reference to his person as it:

Answer.

I haue as often told you, that though other names haue as neere relation to his person, yet they haue not so neere relation to vs, to our saluation and recouery out of the iawes of sinne and Sathan, which he performed for vs by this name, and by no other; for as the Apostle saith, there is no other name vnder heauen by which we shall be saued but onely the name of the Lord IESVS.

Append.

Fiftly in attributing more honour and dignity to the naked name, then to the person of Iesus; since we bow not at this name Iesus in regard of his person; for then wee would bow at the mention of euery name that discyphers or represents his person to vs, as much as at his name Iesus:

but

but to his person in respect of this his name Iesus, since wee bow onely at it, but not at any other of his names: Now to preferre the very naked name of Iesus before his person, as *many* doe, how great a sacriledge, & impiety is it?

Answere.

This is a fond cavill to say wee attribute more honour to the naked name, then to the person, for we attribute no honour to the name, as it is divided from the person, for this were worse then superstition, and as you say a great sacriledge; for in this and all his other names, the person is still implyed. But we bow vnto his person in this relation rather then in any other, for reasons before mentioned: so that we make no comparison betweene his name and his person as you imagine; but the comparison rests betweene his person with his name, and his person with other names; so then, we doe giue much more honour, and reverence, and thanks to Christ, as he is a IESVS; then to the same Christ, as he is a Lord, or a King, or a Iudge, or a Potentate, or a Prince, or any other of his titles.

Appendix.

Sixtly, in causing men to take the name of our Lord Iesus Christ in vaine, (*a direct breach of the third commandement*) in that they ignorantly carelessly, customarily, and superficially for the most part cap and bow vnto it, without any reverence too, any regard or consideration of his person: which is certainly a great takiug of Christs name in vaine, especially if this capping and bowing be a duty of the Text.

Answere.

This indeede were a great sinne, to cause men to breake one of the morall commandements; I thought you would not haue laid so heauy an imputation vpon this order of the Church, that it should make one transgresse in a direct manner one of Gods commandements. And you proue this as well, for by the reason you bring, wee should not onely not bow at the name of IESVS, but not so much as pray vnto God, because many men ignorantly, carelesly, customarily and superficially for the most part pray vnto God, without any reuerence to, or any regard or consideration of his person, which according to you must needs be a great taking of Gods name in vaine: but who sees not that this is an vsuall and old worme eaten fallacy, to take away the vse, for the abuse; if any bow not so carefully as they ought, let them be better instructed.

Append.

Lastly, Not a laudable, orderly, or decent Ceremony as all ceremonies ought to be. First, because it confounds one duty with another; if this bowing be a duty: as prayer, hearing, and reading, with bowing; in causing men in the very middest of their hearing, reading, and praying, euen most abruptly, before they come at any stop or Comma, to rise vp to cring, to cap, and bow at the name Iesus; and so to bow, to cringe, to read, to pray, or heare euen all together.

Answere

Answere.

You much mistake the matter, none teach that those who are kneeling already should rise vp to bow, for their actuall kneeling is sufficient, but the iniunction is for such as stand or sit, to bow or put off the hat at this name Iesus; so that here is no confusion, but a decent conioyning one duty with an other, whereas the same men may easily heare and bow, or read and bow together.

Appendix.

Secondly, because it disturbes & interupts men in their devotions, by auocating their bodies and minds from those serious duties about which they are imployed, and to which they should be wholy intent. It is impossible for any man who doth *hoc agere*; who doth pray feruently, hearken attentiuely, meditate seriously, read affectionally, euen with all his heart and mind, as he ought to doe, in the very middest of his praiers, hearing, reading, preaching, or meditating, to bow seriously, and reuerently at euery sound or mention of the name Iesus, (which requires not onely the head and knee, but the mind; the heart and affections too) without much avocation, interruption, & disturbance; since they are seuerall, and distinct actions; and since both of them require the whole inward and outward man at once.

Answere.

Here is no disturbance at all but in your fancy, no avocating of mens bodies and minds from their serious duties, but rather an exercising and practising

sing as well their bodies as their minds in the service of God; who requires both at our hands, but you are loath to afford him your body,

You say it is impossible to doe them both together as we should, I told you it is not required you should rise when you are once kneeling, neither is it a practise with any, though when they are kneeling why they may not bow their bodies I see no disturbance no difficulty in it; but for those that stand or sit, I can perceaue no difficulty, much lesse impossibility to read and bow the body together, or to heare and bow the body at the same time: when as bowing the body doth neither hinder nor interrupt, either the one or the other.

I but they cannot be *done because they be seuerall actions.*

As though no two actions could be done together, as though the tongue could not talke, and the hand be lifted vp at the same time. as though the eare could not heare and the knee bow both together; who would euer speake so against common-sense and experience?

I but both of them require the whole inward and outward man at once.

Here you contradict your selfe, for if the inward and outward man are required both at once, then I say they may be employed both at once without any disturbance one of the other, then ought you not to pray in heart only, but shew forth your devotion by some outward signe of bodily gesture.

Append.

Certainely, as *no man can serue two Masters at once*, so no man without much disturbance, *disorder and confusion*, can both pray and bow, or heare, or read and bow at the name of Iesus at once, since one of them hinders and puts out the other. Wherefore it is no such orderly, laudable, or decent Ceremony, as some suggest.

Answere.

I wonder that you should argue thus loosely, *no man can serue two Masters*, therefore we can not both pray and bow, or read and bow together; as if it were as hard a matter to bow in our praying or bow in our reading; in a word, as if it were as hard a matter to serue God in our bodyes and in our soules, as it is to serue two Masters; whereas, this we are told is impossible to be done, yet the other wee are commanded to doe.

Saint *Austin* was of a farre different opinion, who thought that those reuerent and decent gestures of the body, were so farre from avocating, disturbing, interrupting or hindering our devotions; that he thought they were a great helpe and furtherance to our inward service of God: and that *God did command these outward testimonyes of our inward service, not as if he had any neede of them, but we our selues. For by these outward signes, saith* Saint *Austin, man doth rather excite and stirre vp himselfe to pray with a greater measure of fervency and humility, and I know not how it comes to passe*, saith the same Father

Deus non indiget his indiciis vt humanus ei pandatur animus sed his magis se ipsum excitat homo ad orandum gemẽdumq́, humilius atq́, ferventius, & nescio quomodo cum hi motus corporis fieri nisi motu animi precedente non possent iisdem rursus externis visibiliter factis ille interior invisibilis qui eos fecit augetur ac per hoc cordis affectus qui vt fierent ista præcessit quia facta sunt crescit.

--Austin de cura pro mort: gerenda cap. 6.

ther, *but so it is, that whereas these motions of the body, can not be done, without the motions of the soule going before, yet by these sensible and visible motions of the body, that inward and invisible motion of the soule, which caused them, is much encreased by them; and so the good affection of the hart, which first caused these outward motions, doth afterwards by a certaine kinde of reaction suffer it selfe to bee enlarged by them.*

Append.

Bowing to Idolized Altars is a practize much in vse of late among some Romanizing Protestants: who as they turne Communion Tables into Altars, *contrary to the practize of the Christians in the primitiue Church, who had no Altars, (for which the Gentiles taxed them) but Communion Tables onely made of wood, not stone; and those commonly placed in the middest, not at the East-end of their Churches*: yea contrary to the custome and practise *of our owne and all other Reformed Churches, who haue, turned Altars into Comunion Tables, not Tables into Altars, which they quite reiect, as appendants vnto Priests, to legall Sacrifices, and Popish Masses; so they likewise bow downe to them, and worship them, even with bended knees, & heads, & harts; in the very selfe-same manner as the Papists doe adore their Images, Saints, and Altars*: contrary to the *expresse command of God*: contrary to the practise of the Primitiue, and all reformed Churches, *which yeelds them no such precedent*, and that vpon no other reasons, but such as are meerely Popish and Idolatrous: to wit, because the Altar doth put them in minde of Christ or represent him to them, as really as the name of Iesus doth, at which they vse to bow:

Answere.

Answer.

You were about to conclude, but in the middest thereof, you thrust in a long parenthesis, which I haue here put together by it selfe, wherein you make a digression from bowing at the name of IESVS, against bowing at Altars or Communion tables.

Where I wonder you should bee so much ouerseene to fall vpon a new argument: had you let it alone, here had beene matter enough for you, to make another booke: but in a few words you finde much fault. The first and greatest is, that some vse to bow comming to the comunion table: which I must confesse, is so much the lesse warrantable, because we haue no text of scripture, nor any Canon of our Church for it, as I know of: yet see I no great reason, why any should be offended at a decent and and lowly reuerence, which is shewed when wee come into the house of God: especially when wee come neere that place where those high and heavenly misteryes of our salvation, are to bee consecrated and celebrated with all the solemnity and devotion we can possibly imagine; shall we come into these houses, and neere those places, as we come into a common Inne or Alehouse? is there no respect, no regard to be showed in the one aboue the other? I think common reason and discretion will teach vs the contrary. And here you cannot forbeare to bestow vpon them bitter and prouoking language, in calling them, *Romanizing Protestants*: could they

not as easily, and vpon as good ground, if they were disposed, call you and some others *Genevaizing* or *Amsterdanizing* Protestants? but such words accompany not peace, but strife.

Another fault you finde, is, that we turne *Communion tables into Altars, against the practise of the primitiue Church, who had no Altars but Comunion tables; &c.* to proue this, you ouer charge your margent with quotations; but I will ease both the Printer and the Reader of them, and answere you in a worde. That those authors speake against the Iewish and heathenish Altars, not the Christian. For he that hath read but a little in antiquity, shall soone findethat the Fathers every where call our Cõmunion a[a] sacrifice, and our Communion tables[b] Altars; and for this, were I as ambitious of quotations, as you are, I could bring as many places and make my margent swell as bigg as yours, but a few shall suffice. And therefore your charging vs of turning Communion tables into Altars is idle, when as the same table is in divers respects, both a Cõmunion table and an Altar. For if we consider the Eucharist as a sacrifice in the representation of the breaking the breadand powring forth the cupp, the table is fitly called an Altar: but if you consider the Eucharist as a sacrament, which is nothing els but a distribution and application of the sacrifice to the seuerall receauers, it is as fitly called a Communion table; and therefore your talke of turning the Communion Table into an Altar doth but betray your ignorance.

a Epiphan. heres. 79. Hieron. Epist. ad Evagrium, August. lib. 4. de Trinit. cap. 14. lib. 20. cont. Faust. Manich. cap. 18. Cyprian. lib. 2. epist. 3. Chrysost: hom. 60. ad populum. Euseb. lib. 1. de demonstrat evangel. cap. vlt.

b Tertull: lib. de panit: & lib. de Orat. Cyprian lib. 1. epist. 9. Euseb. de demõstrat. Evangel: lib. 1. cap. 6. Ambros: epist: l. b. 5. cap. 33. Nazien: orat. in Gorgoniam Nyssen. lib. de baptismo. Chrysost: hom. 53. ad populum August. lib. 8. de Civit. dei cap. vlt. Optatus Milevit lib. 6. cont. Parmenianum.

Another

Another thing is, you must haue them made of wood not of stone, as it was aunciently practised.

But of this there can be no certaine rule, because some of the Fathers are one way, some another; so the matter is not great, whether it be of stone, as *Nyssen*, or of wood, as *Optatus*, it skilles not, saith our learned Bishop.

Another point is of as little moment, that you would haue them placed in the midst, not at the East end of the Church.

But herein it is the safest to follow the practise of the primitiue Church, if the Church haue setled nothing to the contrary already. Lastly our practise of bowing at the name of IESVS, doth nothing countenance the popish bowing to Saints and Images, as I haue told you before; because they haue no text for theirs, we haue.

Appendix.

Since therefore it is most apparent by all the premises, that this bowing at the name of Iesus, is neither a duty of the Text, as some: nor yet a Ceremony; (much lesse an arbitrary, harmelesse, decent, laudable, orderly Ceremony) as others teach and publish: but in truth *a meere Popish Inuention of punie times, to countenance, to iustifie their worshipping of Images, Crosses, Crucifixes, Hoasts, Reliques, &c.* I hope the zealous practisers, patrons, and Abetters of it who are *commonly more obseruant of such trifling Ceremonies, then of the weightiest* Christian duties) will from hence for shame desert, not onely the Patronage, but the very practise of boing at the name of Iesus, and of all their Altar-geniculations too, till they can produce some better Authorities,

rities, Warrants, grounds, and reasons, to iustifie, to defend them, then any yet alleadged.

Answere.

Since therefore it is most apparent by all the premises, that this bowing at the name of IESVS, is both a duty of the text, as some say, and also a ceremony, as others: not onely harmelesse, decent, laudable and orderly; but a reuerent, religious, devoute, and significant ceremony, and in truth no popish invention of puny times to countenance, to iustify their worshipping of Images, Crosses, &c. I hope the zealous oppugners, adversaries, and writers against it (who commonly stumble at strawes and leap ouer blocks and are many times more offended at the laudable ceremonies of the Church, then they are at the transgression of some morall Christian duty) will from hence for shame, if forth not for feare, desert and leaue off to write or speake against it; and will hereafter not onely patronize in others, but also practise in themselues this bowing at the name of IESVS, till they can produce some better authorities, warrants, grounds, and reasons, to oppugne and gainesay it, then any yet alleadged.

FINIS.

A FVRTHER IVSTIFICATION OF BOWING AT THE NAME OF *IESVS.*

OR

AN EXAMINATION OF SVCH CONSIDERABLE REASONS AS ARE made by Mr *Prinne* in a reply to Mr *Widdowes* concerning *the same argument.*

By WILLIAM PAGE *Bac. of Divinity and Fellow of* Alsoules *Colledge in* Oxford.

S. August. de Contrit: Cordis. cap. 5.
IESV, *propter nomen tuum dulce, fac mihi secundum nomen tuum.*

Tertul: lib. 3. ad. Marcion. cap. 16.
Mihi vendico Christum, *Mihi defendo* IESVM.

OXFORD
Printed by IOHN LICHFIELD Printer to the Famous Vniversity.
Ann. Dom. 1631.

To the Reader.

GEntle and Iudicious reader, it is not vnknowne vnto thee that Mr Prinne *an vtter Barrester of* Lincolnes Inne *hath long since put forth an* Appendix *against bowing at the name of* IESVS, *and of late another booke of his against* Mr Widdowes, *in defence of the former argument, wherein he shewes much virulency and bitternesse against* Mr Widdowes *his person, and also is pleased to bring me in, as a principall agent about* Mr Widdowes *his booke, by publishing this in Print*, that it was so mangled, interlaced and razed by Mr *Page* and others who pervsed it before its approbation, that there was scarce one page in all the coppy in which there was not severall written errors, absurdities and impertinences quite expunged.

I must confesse, that I had the pervsall of it, but that I neither mangled nor interlined nor razed nor altered one word in it, Mr Widdowes *and others can witnesse. Not that I am ashamed to declare my selfe in this cause, or that I mislike the argument, as will appeare by this treatise, or that it had beene any preiudice*

dice to me to croſſe out thoſe things that were amiſſe; but that others may know, that what fault ſoeuer eſcaped vncroſſed, was not by my approbation. As for thoſe bitter words and other perſonall points which concerne Mr Widdowes, *I leaue them vnto him againſt whom they were directed; but becauſe I haue begunne already to iuſtify our Canon and cuſtome of bowing at the name of* Ieſus *in my anſwere to his Appendix. I haue here examined all thoſe materiall points, which may concerne the cauſe in hand in this laſt tract of his.*

But wherein he takes occaſion to calumniate that worthy Prelate B. Andrewes, *to taxe our carefull and diſcreete* Vicechanc. *to diſgrace our* Communion, *and debaſe our ſolemne ſinging of* Praiers, *I ſay, in theſe things, I will leaue him to be examined by the higher powers.*

As for his relation at the latter end about the beginning and progreſſe of bowing at the name of Ieſus, *I haue ſufficiently anſwered it pag.* 13. *&c. of my former tract, for what if the Papiſts did begin this cuſtome, (which notwithſtanding he will never be able to proue) and haue abuſed it, what is that to vs? who haue reſtored it to the right vſe.*

*He likewiſe repeateth the ſame thing about bowing at the communion table, which alſo I haue touched. pag.*123. *As for his multitude of authors which hee citeth pag.*39. *&c. together with all thoſe in his former booke I reſerue my particular anſwere of them vntill ſuch time as he ſhall bring their words. But thoſe things which I take to be conſiderable in this*

To the Reader.

GEntle and Iudicious reader, it is not vnknowne vnto thee that Mr Prinne *an vtter Barrester of* Lincolnes Inne *hath long since put forth an* Appendix *against bowing at the name of* IESVS, *and of late another booke of his against* Mr Widdowes, *in defence of the former argument, wherein he shewes much virulency and bitternesse against* Mr Widdowes *his person, and also is pleased to bring me in, as a principall agent about* Mr Widdowes *his booke, by publishing this in Print*, that it was so mangled, interlaced and razed by Mr *Page* and others who pervsed it before its approbation, that there was scarce one page in all the coppy in which there was not severall written errors, absurdities and impertinences quite expunged.

I must confesse, that I had the pervsall of it, but that I neither mangled nor interlined nor razed nor altered one word in it, Mr Widdowes *and others can witnesse. Not that I am ashamed to declare my selfe in this cause, or that I mislike the argument, as will appeare by this treatise, or that it had beene any preiudice*

dice to me to croſſe out thoſe things that were amiſſe; but that others may know, that what fault ſoeuer eſcaped vncroſſed, was not by my approbation. As for thoſe bitter words and other perſonall points which concerne Mr Widdowes, *I leaue them vnto him againſt whom they were directed; but becauſe I haue begunne already to iuſtify our Canon and cuſtome of bowing at the name of* Ieſus *in my anſwere to his Appendix. I haue here examined all thoſe materiall points, which may concerne the cauſe in hand in this laſt tract of his.*

But wherein he takes occaſion to calumniate that worthy Prelate B. Andrewes, *to taxe our carefull and diſcreete* Vicechanc. *to diſgrace our* Communion, *and debaſe our ſolemne ſinging of* Praiers, *I ſay, in theſe things, I will leaue him to be examined by the higher powers.*

As for his relation at the latter end about the beginning and progreſſe of bowing at the name of Ieſus, *I haue ſufficiently anſwered it pag.* 13. *&c. of my former tract, for what if the Papiſts did begin this cuſtome, (which notwithſtanding he will never be able to proue) and haue abuſed it, what is that to vs? who haue reſtored it to the right vſe.*

*He likewiſe repeateth the ſame thing about bowing at the communion table, which alſo I haue touched. pag.*123. *As for his multitude of authors which hee citeth pag.*39. *&c. together with all thoſe in his former booke I reſerue my particular anſwere of them vntill ſuch time as he ſhall bring their words. But thoſe things which I take to be conſiderable in this*

booke and to the point in hand, are these foure. First his ten queries.pag.12. 2 Whether the name Iesus *or* Christ *be the greater names of sorrow and suffering, pag.20.&6.3 Whether of these two names are most to be reverenced,& honoured by vs:pag.25. And lastly whether the Cannon of our Church doe entend that which we practise, but he seemes to deny it pag. 46. All these I haue examined in this order here proposed, referring all to thy vnpartiall iudgement, and will be*

Thine so long as thou art
the Churches

WILLIAM PAGE.

Querie 1.

WHAT auncient Fathers or Authors can be produced to proue this bowing at the recitall of the name of *Iesus* a duty of the text, and what are their names?

Answere.

First I answere, that I haue brought many Fathers to proue that by bowing in that text is meant not an inward subiection of the hart onely, but also some outward expression of bodylie reverence, as you may see Pag. 81. &c: And likewise I haue brought many other Fathers and writers to proue that by name in the text is meant the name IESVS, as you may see Pag. 58. &c. So then put both these together and they will make vp that conclusion and exposition which you refuse. But I can finde but few that ioyne both these together, for those that speake of bowing, commonly say nothing of the name, and those that tell what is meant by the name, vsually say nothing of bowing the knee.

Secondly suppose that the Fathers had giuen no furtherance to this exposirion. I say it is not necessa-

ry, that your Fathers should thus expound the text: It is sufficient that their expositions doe not crosse & contradict that which we striue for. For you must knowe Sr, that although in poynts fundamentall and those that doe necessarily belong to our salvation, *he that is not with vs is against vs*. Yet in superstructures, and poynts not fundamentall, especially in rites and ceremonies belonging to Gods service, as this is here we speake of, *he that is not against vs is with vs or for vs*. Thus then, proue if you can that the expositions of the Auncients vpon this text, are opposite and contrary to this precept and practise of our Church, and then you say somethinge. For some Fathers expound this text of the last day of iudgement, and this indeed is the principall scope of it. But doe they therefore deny that such reverence is to be done in the meane time; nay they rather intimate, that now *some* ought to bow vnto this name, if *all* must then.

Luc. 11, 23.

Luc. 9, 50.

Others say, that by bowing here is meant subiection, but doth subiection exclude the outward expression of it in bodilie gesture? or doth it not rather include it? Thus then you shall not finde the Fathers by their expositions to thwart and overthrowe what we intend, they may haue diverse, but they haue not adverse interpretations.

Neither is this any disparagement to those glorious lights that the Church now, or some learned Neotericks should see a little farther into a text, then they did. For it is a common saying which you cannot mislike, that a dwarfe sitting vpon a Giants back,

back, may see farther then the Giant himselfe. Thus then, it is no marvaile though some in latter times, especially that subtle searcher into a text, vsing the helps of those Ancient worthies, be able to pry somewhat more narrowly into a text, and pick out a farther, though not a contrary meaning to theirs: especially if it be in a matter of smaller moment and consequence; For those great pillars of the Church were busied about weightier poynts, as in defending of the Trinity; in maintayning of the Deity of the Sonne and the Holy Ghost, they had no leasure to thinke of circumstantiall ceremonies. B. *Andrewes.*

Thirdly, although you hold that to be vncovered in time of divine service, be both a duty of the text, and also a Canon of our Church: yet it would trouble you to proue that the Fathers, and ancient authors with a ioynt consent, did thus expound that text to the Corinthians. So then to your first foure queries which are your chiefest, I will put you foure requiries, and to this first querie of yours, my requiry shall be this. 1 Cor. 11. 7.

What ancient Fathers or Authors can be produced to proue that our custome of bowing at the name of IESVS is against or contrary to that text of the Phil. and what are their names.

Querie. 2.

What Fathers or ancient Records doe testifie that bowing at the name of *Iesus* was vsed in the primitiue Church, and what are their words.

Answere.

Ego illos veneror, & tantis nominibus semper assurgo Senec epist. 64.

You talke much of the ancient Fathers and primitiue Church: and farr be it from me to detract any thinge from that reverence and authority which is due vnto them. *I for my part doe highly esteeme of them and shall alwayes honour their memorialls,* I take them after the holy Scripture, to be a very good direction for vs to follow, both in matter of doctrine, and discipline. And for my part, let that rule which *Vincentius Lirinensis* hath long agoe giuen, be ever embraced, *whatsoever all or the greatest part of them in one and the same meaning shall with one consent say plainely, frequently, and constantly, let that be accounted for vndoubtedly and certainely truth.* And I will not be afraid to say with S. Austin: *what they beleeue I beleeue, what they hold I hold, what they publish I publish: yeeld to them and you shall not hurt me, stand to them and you shall be quiet for me.* And I am verely perswaded, in my poore iudgement, that it is the greatest, if not the only cause, of these manyfold distractions in religion, that men will not hearken to these ancient Fathers; they thinke that primitiue doctrine is too old for them, they haue purer conceits of their owne. Bnt let them enioy their conceits, this consent of ancient Fathers shall sway me till I can finde out a better direction. This is my opinion of them: But I am afraid, you brag and boast of the Fathers, and the primitiue Church, and yet when it comes to triall, you care for neither of them; for you ascribe vnto them more then is their due, and

Quicquid omnes vel plures vno eodemque sensu &c. Id pro indubitato certo ratoque habeatur cap. 39.

Quod credunt credo, quod tenent teneo, quod prædicat prædico, istis cede & me non cædes acquiesce istis & quiesces a me lib. 2. ad Iulianum.

and yet will not giue them what is their due. As though the Church could vse no ceremony now, but shee must haue it from the primitiue Church: shee honoureth the primitiue Church sufficiently, if shee retaine those ceremonies that are left vnto her; but that shee should be confined to these, and vse no more, never any yet affirmed, but such a Divine as you. For the learned knowe, that the Church hath power to make ceremonies continually as shee thinketh fitt: It would be a hard matter for you to proue out of the Fathers and ancient Records that they vsed in the primitiue Church to stand vp at the Creed, or when the Gospell is read, or to kneele at the Communion, and yet I hope our Church doth lawfully and laudably vse these ceremonies. It is sufficient for vs that the primitiue Church doth not determine any thinge contrary to our customes. But we must not argue negatiuely, the primitiue Church vsed it not, Ergo we must not vse it; It were well & to be wished that we could bring you to this, to wit, to yeeld affirmatiuely, The primitiue Church vsed to doe thus and thus, therefore we ought to doe so. Then I am sure you would obserue many auncient rites and ceremonies which you now laugh at. And to this second querie of yours I returne this requiry.

What Fathers or auncient Records doe testifie that bowing at the name of IESVS was misliked in the primitiue Church, and what are their words?

Querie 3.

What auncient authorities there are before *Zanchius*, *Whitegift*, or *Hooker*, which testifie that bowing at the name of *Iesus* was vsed in the time of *Arius*?

Answere.

These mens authorities are sufficient, till you disproue them; therefore bring me three other or but one author auncient or new of the like note, that say this bowing was not vsed in the time of *Arius*, and then you say something. For I cannot thinke, but that these learned & worthy writers had good reason to say what they did, and vpon very good grounds, though I am not able to discerne them. Therefore I will not trouble my selfe to bring any more to affirme it, till you can bring as many that deny it, and their bare denyall shall not serue the turne, vnlesse they shew some reason or good authority for it.

And to this query of yours I make this requiry.

What auncient authorities there are before *Zanchy*, *Whitegift*, and *Hooker*, which testify that bowing at the name of IESVS, was not vsed in the time of *Arius*?

Querie. 4.

Whether there be any one father who speakes directly and punctually of bowing at the name of Iesus and who he is if any such there be?

Answere

Answere.

This hath beene satisfied in my answere to your first querie: but suppose this, that no one Father speakes directly or punctually of bowing at the name of IESVS? What then? is it therfore vnlawfull? is it therefore irreligious for vs to vse it? This you shall never be able to proue, that we are so limitted and confined to the auncient Fathers, that the Church now cannot say or doe any more but iust what they either sayd or did. For the present Church hath power to adde, euen in points of doctrine, much more in matters of discipline and ceremony, to those things the Fathers haue left vs. I say she hath power to adde and to encrease that patrimony they haue left vs: but not to detract or diminish ought from it, as *Vincentius* hath well declared, for hauing first shewed that wee must keepe carefully that precious *depositum* or doctrine which the Fathers haue left vs, at length hee makes this obiection; *what, is there no growth of religion to be lookt for in the Church of Christ? yes* saith he, *and that very great too, but so*, saith he, *that it be a growth, not an alteration and change; let the religion of our soules imitate the fashion of bodies, which bodies of ours, though in processe of time they somewhat alter and grow greater, yet they remaine the same bodies they were before: there is great difference betweene the flower of youth, and the ripenesse of old age, but they be the same men, that were young, but now are old: and although the habite and stature of*

Nullusne ergo in ecclesia Christi profectus habebitur religionis? habeatur sane & maximus. Sed ita tamen vt vere profectus sit ille fidei non permutatio, &c. cap. 28. Imitetur animarum religio rationem corporum, &c.

one

one and the same man be changed, yet notwithstanding there is the same nature, one and the same person remaining: the parts and members of Children are small, those of young men greater, yet are they the very same, looke how many arteryes and veines there be in little ones, so many and no more there be in men: or if there appeare more parts in riper yeares, they were sowed before in the very seede, that you shall finde nothing new in old men, which did not before ly hid in the same parties when they were young, &c. Where he excellently proues, that this increasing is good so it be *in the same opinion, the same sense and meaning.*

In eodem dogmate, eodem sensu eademq; sententia.

And so to this fourth query I make this requiry. Whether there be any one father, who speakes directly or indirectly that we should not bow at the name of IESVS and who hee is, if any such there be?

Querie. 5.

Whether Popes or Popish councells and authors were not the first broachers and chiefe propagaters of this ceremony?

Answer.

Propagaters I confesse they were, and that is all which your bundle of authors proue, in the end of this booke, but that they were the first broachers of it, you must bring stronger reasons before you can make vs believe it. Pope *Iohn* the 20, you say, is the first you read of that set abroach this ceremony

ny of bowing at the name of IESVS; what then? Therefore could it not be before, because you haue not read of it? Whereby you would giue your reader to vnderstand, that you haue pervsed all antiquity, and because *you* cannot find any higher originall of it in your reading, therefore there must needs be the beginning of this ceremony. Much I confesse, you may haue read, but that you haue read so much, beleeue it who will, I will not, but this by the way.

To the point what saith Pope *Iohn* the 20 or Pope *Gregory* the 10, they both of them indeede make iniunctions to haue this ceremony observed, but doe either of them say they were the first that set it on foote, no such matter; but it seemes men were carelesse in their times, as they be now, of obseruing it, and therefore they made these lawes to keepe them to that more strictly, which before they were not so carefull to performe: I haue good reason to thinke so, because learned and iudicious *Zanchy* saith it was a most auncient custome in the Churches, and therefore did not begin with Pope *Iohn* the 20. which hee could not say but vpon good grounds, and you confesse that not onely he, but *Whitegift* and *Hooker* also say it was vsed in the time of *Arius*, which must needs be then in the Primitiue Church; for *Arius* was before the first Councell of *Nice*.

Shew the contrary by some positiue authority of note that say this bowing was not vsed in the time of *Arius* and you say something.

Querie 6.

What difference there is betweene Papists and Protestants bowing at the name of Iesus, since protestants condemne them for this ceremony and yet doe vse it?

Answere.

We condemne not in Papists the vse of bowing, but the abuse of it. So then, though we both vse it, yet the difference is great in the manner and end of this bowing. For first the Papists thinke this word to be magicall and to haue all the force of it included in the sound and syllables of it (if we may beleeue Mr *Calvin* vpon this place to the *Philip:*) but we bow not to the sound, but to the sense of it, not to the letters and sillables of the name, but to the due acknowledgement of that infinite benefit and favour we receiue by vertue of this name: And I am the rather induced to beleeue that the Papists, some of them at least, attribute too much to the very letters and sillables of the name, because *Lucas Tudensis* maketh many mysteries and strange meanings in the very letters themselues.

Lib. 2. cap. 16.

For first, saith he, this word IESVS comprehends in it the very name *Iehovah*; and he proues it thus, for take, saith he, these three terminations of the word IESVS (for it hath no more) IESVS IESV IESVM, & the three last letters of them will make vp this word *Sum* which signifieth [*I am*] which is the exposition of the name *Iehovah*. Againe this word IESVS hath in it three vowels i. e. u. & one consonant

Lib. 2. cap. 16.

S; the three vowels note vnto vs the Trinity: the consonant decyphereth the humanity of Christ, which because it consisteth of body and soule S. is doubled, the one notes the Soule, the other the body.

Againe take this word in the accusatiue case IESVM there is IE which signifieth God, and SVM *I am*, so that IESVM is as much as *Deus sum I am God.*

Besides, saith hee, take the two first letters of IESVS and that is IE: one name of God: take away I, from before it and S, that followes it, then e u, will make *eu* another name of God: againe read e u backward, and that is *ue* another name of God; but that this great name might bee pronounced of vs without danger and to our comfort: God in his wisdome added a double S vnto it which signifies a Sauiour, for without the humanity we cannot heare God speake vnto vs without danger, and S: is in the midst betweene to syllables, to shew Christ to be the mediator.

These and such like conceits of the name IESVS are invented rather for sport, then any serious dispute.

Secondly the Papists thinke that this name hath the vertue in it to driue away devills, and therefore bow vnto it, we imagine no such thing.

Thirdly Popes did vse to grant many daies indulgence to those who should bend their knees to the name of IESVS; we practise, nor allow of no such matter; other differences might be found out, but these shall suffice.

Querie. 7.

What reasons are there, that men should bow onely at the name of Iesus, more then at the name of Saviour, which is the same with Iesus, or at the name of Emanuell, God, or the like?

Answere.

This argument was brought in your former tract, and is there answered: that God the Father would haue vs bow at the name of IESVS; now Saviour is not the name it selfe, but onely the interpretation of it; but the text doth not say, you shall bowe at the interpretation of the name, but *at the name.* You might as well aske why wee should not bow to this name σωτης, or *Salvator*, as well as to Saviour, when as these are nothing, but the sense of this name in diverse languages: you know that his name was also called *Emmanuell*, as the prophet foretold, and the Angell verefied, which being interpreted, is *God with vs:* will any man therefore say that *God with vs* is his name, when as it is but the meaning and explication of his name. Why wee should bow at the name of IESVS rather then the name of God I haue shewed, because God is a name of power and maiesty, but IESVS a name of pitty and mercy: vnder this name of God, the whole Trinity is displeased with vs, but vnder this name IESVS, reconciled vnto vs againe: there is no comfort in the name of God, without a IESVS. Why not to the name *Emanuell*, & other names of his you may see pag. 63. &c. of my former tract.

Isa. 7. 14.

Mat. 1. 23.

Querie

Querie 8.

Why men ſhould rather bow at the mention of the ſecond, then of the firſt perſon in the Trinity, ſince Chriſt himſelfe tels vs *Iohn.* 5.23. that all men muſt honor the ſon as they honor the Father, and no otherwiſe: And *Phil.*2.10. informes vs, that Chriſt by his exaltation, is onely in the glory (as the Fathers and others reade it) not aboue the glory of God the Father, at whoſe name none euer bow?

Anſwer.

This was another of your arguments before, and therefore you needed not to make it a querie here: where I told you, that you conſider not, that this honour done to the Sonne, redoundes to the honour of God the Father alſo. Firſt, in that wee doe it, not of our owne heads, but at his command and direction: now, that which hee commandeth vs to doe, can be no diſhonour to him, if we doe it: but the diſhonour to him were if wee ſhould refuſe to doe it at his requeſt. Secondly as the honour of the Sonne begins with the Father, for he is the author and cauſe of it, he hath giuen him this name, and he will haue euery knee to bow vnto it; ſo it alſo ends with him for the Apoſtle ſaieth *it is to the glory of God the father* not as you would haue it *in the glory of God the Father*, though ſome of the auncient read it thus, yet the originall is plaine εἰς δόξαν not ἐν δόξα *vnto the glory* not *in the glory of God the Father.* And no mervaile, for it redoundes much to his glory, that we ſhould thus honour his ſonne, as *Chry-*

sostome hath obserued vpon these wordes and the Evangelist is as playne, *hee that honoureth not the sonne, the same honoureth not the Father*. So then the reason is playne why wee bow not at the name of the Father, because we haue no command, no text for it: all that he commands vs, is but this, that we *should not take his name in vaine*. And besides, this bowing to the sonne, is an implicite bowing to the Father, at whose command, and vnto whose glory we doe it.

John 5. 23.

Querie 9.

Whether the sole bowing at the name of Iesus bee not superstition in the opinion of Dr. *Willet*, Dr. *Fulke*, *Pareus* and other protestant writers? and why men should rather bow at the pronũciation of the name Iesus then at the sight it in a bible, a wall, or glasse windowe, or in the frontispice of a Iesuites booke: before all which it is prefixed, since at *the name of Iesus* may be as aptly applyed to the eye, as to the eare; to the sight, as to the sound or hearing of the name of Iesus?

Answere.

Here you make two queries in one. To the first I answere you, that our custome of bowing at the name of IESVS, is not superstition in the opinion of these three you name. For Dr. *Willet* doth taxe indeede popish bowing, but speaking of our bowing he saith thus *It may be also vsed well, when the mind is free from superstition, in signe of reuerence to his Maiesty, as in a matter wherein Christian liberty ought to haue place*. Dr. *Fulke*, saith thus on the same

On Phil. 2. 10.

same place *Protestants haue onely taken away the superstitious abuse of the name* IESVS *in Popery, but wee iudge not, neither condemne those, that doe vse it, being free from superstition, and grounded in knowledge, and carefull not to giue offence*; and such bowing ours may well be called.

Pareus saith thus: *which geniculation*, saith he, *if it be performed with outward reverence as an indifferent rite or ceremony, no man mislikes it: but if any take it to be a worship of God enioyned, it is superstition to be reproued.* But we account it not the worship of God it selfe, but a signe and outward ceremony of it. What other Protestant writers say I haue declared in the other tract pag.

Quæ geniculatio si vt ritus indifferens præstetur externa reverentia nemo improbat, si vt cultus præceptus superstitio est reprehensibilis in Rom. 14.

But suppose they should call it superstitious, is not the authority of B. *Andrews*, *Hooker*, *Zanchy*, *Whitegift* on the contrary as great as theirs at the least.

To the second I answere: that the Church who knowes better what is fit to bee done, then either you or I, will haue vs to doe lowly reuerence at the mentioning or naming of IESVS, and not vpon any other occasion, and this shall quiet me; but such busie questioners, and inquirers as you, I see nothing can quiet.

Querie 10.

Whether the not bowing at euery recitall of the name of Iesus in time of divine service be a sinne or no? (as it must needs be if it be a duty of the text) And why it should be a duty in time of divine service and sermons only (in which of all other times it is most needlesse to expresse mens reverence

reverence, subiection, & high respect to Iesus, because euery part of diuine service, especially kneeling at prayer, prayers vnto Iesus and in the name of Iesus, are nothing else but an ample testimony of our seruice, thankfulnesse, and subiection to him as our Lord, and Sauiour) rather then a duty at other times, when men shew lesse reverence and submission vnto Iesus and are more apt to abuse and prophane his sacred name?

Answere.

Here againe you make two queries. To the first I aske you the like question, whether not to be vncouered in time of divine service be a sinne or no? as it must needs be, if it be a duty of the text, but you confesse that this is a duty of the text. The like I may say for not bowing at the name of IESVS; The fault is the same, being both alike commanded in the text, both alike enioyned by the Church. Yet you must know that the fault is greater or smaller, according to the carriage of him that omits them; for they may be omitted vpon a carelesnesse or negligence, or wilfully and in contempt.

To the second query I say that the Church doth onely enioyne this reuerence in time of divine service and sermons onely, because that is the time in which of all other times, it is most needfull to expresse our subiection, reuerence, and high respect vnto Iesus: But you cleane contrary say, that it is then most needlesse, and you giue this reason for it, because then we are to kneele vnto IESVS in prayer howsoeuer. As though all our divine service consisted in praying on our knees onely? As though we haue

haue not then chapters read out of the Scriptures, and then we vse to sit: the confession of our faith is repeated, and then wee vse to stand: Epistles and Gospels are read at another time, and then we vse either to sit or stand: must we not vpon all these occasions bow to this name? And because it is our custome in Sermon time to be couered, therefore this signe of humility is well expressed then, by putting off the hat, as it is in Queene *Elizabeth* Injunction.

THe ſecond thing to be examined is, whether the name of Chriſt be a greater name of ſorrow and ſuffering, then the name IESVS, ſo that the name Chriſt, doth more directly lead vs to his bitter death and paſſion, then the name IESVS, as you ſeeme to affirme pag. 20. 21. 22. 23. 24. for thus you ſay pag. 20.

If we looke vpon our Saviours humiliation and paſſion, the Scripture informes vs, that *Chriſt was incarnate and borne into the world*, as well as Ieſus, *Mat.* 1,16. *c.* 2.4. *Luke* 2.11. *That Chriſt was mocked, crucified, humbled, deſpiſed, put to death for our ſinnes, and nailed to the croſſe*, (which is alwaies ſtiled *the Croſſe of Chriſt*) as well as Ieſus: *Mat.* 26.63.67.68. *Acts* 3.18. *c*,4.26. *Gal.* 2,20. *c.* 3.13. *c.* 6. 14. *Rom.* 3.8. *c.* 8.34. *c.* 5.8. *c.* 14.9. 1. *Cor.* 15.3. *c.* 1.23. 1 *Pet.* 1.19. *c.* 2.21.23.24. *c.* 3.18. *c.* 4.13.14.16. That *we were redeemed, ſprinkled from an euill conſcience, iuſtified and made nigh vnto God, by the blood, the precious blood of Chriſt*, [not Ieſus] 1 *Pet.* 1.19. *Heb.* 9.14. *Rom.* 5.8.9. *Gal.* 2.87. *Epheſ.* 2. 13. That *God was in Chriſt* [not Ieſus] *reconciling the world vnto himſelfe*: 2 *Cor.* 5.19.20. That *Chriſt* [not Ieſus] *redeemed and made vs free*, *Gal.* 3.13. *c.* 5.1. Hence *Luke.* 24.26. 46: Chriſt himſelfe ſpeakes thus to his Diſciples: Ought not *Chriſt* [not Ieſus] *to haue ſuffered* theſe things, and to enter

 into

into his glory? Thus it is written, and thus it behoueth *Christ* [not Iesus] *to suffer*, and to rise from the dead the third day. And henee the Minister by our Churches appointment, in the administration of the holy *Communion*, saith thus: *Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee, &c. Drinke this in remembrance that Christs blood was shed for thee, &c.* Christ therefore was humbled, suffered and did as much for vs as Iesus; and therefore in this regard deserues as much reuerence, loue & duty from vs, as doth Iesus. If we reflect on Christs exaltation; the Scriptures certifie vs: First, that *Christ was raised againe from the graue*; and that *by his resurrection all his shall be raised vp againe at the last: Rom.6.4. 1 Cor.15.12.13.14.22. Col.3.1.* Secondly that *Christ* [not Iesus] *is exalted to the right hand of God the Father, farre aboue all principalities and powers, and euery name that is named, not onely in this world, but in the world to come, Angells, powers, & Authorities, all things, being made subiect to him: Eph.1.20.21.20.1 Pet.* 3.21.23. *Col.1.7.* to 28, *c.3.1. 1 Cor.15.23.* to 29. Thirdly, that *God hath quickned vs together with Christ*, [not Iesus] *and hath raised vs vp together, and made vs sit together in heauenly places with Christ, Eph.1.3. c.2.5.6.* Fourthly, that *God hath gathered together all things in Christ* [not Iesus] *and that Christ* [not Iesus] *is all and in all: Eph.* 1.10.23. *Gall.3.11.* In this regard therefore Christ is as venerable, as worthy to be bowed to as is Iesus. If we consider the offices and titles of Christ, we shall find Christ as venerable euery way as Iesus. For is Iesus a *Saviour*? *So is Christ: Luke.2.11. Ioh.4.42. Eph.5.23. Phil.3.20.* Is he a Mediator? *So is Christ. 1. Tim.2.5. 1 Iohn* 2.1. Is he a head of the Church? *So is Christ: 1 Cor.11.3. Ephes.4.15. c.1.20.22.* Is he a King, a Lord, a King of Kings, and Lord of Lords? *So is Christ, Acts* 2.36. *Luke* 23.2. *c.* 2.11. 1 *Cor.8.6. 1. Tim.6.14.15.16. Col.3.24. Rev.11.15. c.12.10. c.20.46.* and by our owne Churches confession after the Communion receiued; *Glory be to God on high, &c.*

O

O Lord God, heauenly King, &c. for thou onely art holy, thou onely art the Lord, thou onely O Christ [not Iesus] *with the holy Ghost, art most high in the glory of God the Father.* Is he the Iudge of all men? *So is Christ:* whence *the day of iudgement is stiled the day of Christ, and the place of iudgement, the iudgement seat of Christ,* [not Iesus] 2 *Cor.* 5. 10. *Rom.*14.9.10.

Answere.

You say well, when you ioyne these two names together, and tell vs that Christ was incarnate and borne into the World, as well as IESVS; and that Christ was mocked, crucified, humbled, despised, put to death for our sinnes, & nailed to the Crosse, which is alwaies stiled the Crosse of Christ as well as IESVS.

But afterwards you seeme to seuer them when you bring in diverse places of Scripture wherein *Christ* is named, and not IESVS, then you say *Christ* did this or that, not IESVS: vnto all which places I could answere you by way of retortion thus.

It is written (say you) *ought not Christ* (not IESVS) *to haue suffered these things and to enter into his glory* Luk.24.26.

I answere, it is also written, but *we see* IESVS (not Christ) *who was made a little lower then the Angells, for suffering of death crowned with glory and honour.* Heb.2.9.

It is written say you *we are redeemed with the precious blood of Christ* (not IESVS) 1.Pet.1.19. *and*

how much more shall the blood of Christ (not IESVS) *Purge your conscience from dead workes*. Heb: 9.14. *and yee are made nigh by the blood of Christ* (not IESVS) Ephes. 2.13.

And is it not written? *hauing therefore bretheren boldnes to enter into the holyest by the blod of* IESVS (not Christ) Heb.10.19. and againe *wherefore* IESVS *also* (not Christ) *that hee might sanctify the people with his owne blood suffered without the gate*. Heb. 13.12.

It is written *while we were yet sinners Christ* (not IESVS) *dyed for vs Rom*:5.8.

And it is written likewise, *if wee believe that* IESVS (not Christ) *dyed and rose againe*, *and they had certayne questions against him of their owne superstition and of one* IESVS (not Christ) *which was dead Act*. 25.19. *and hee prophecyed that* IESVS (not Christ) *should dye for that nation Ioh*:11.51.

You say it is written that *God was in Christ* (not IESVS) *reconciling the world vnto himselfe*.2. Cor:5.19. *and that Christ* (not IESVS) *hath redeemed and made vs free* Gal.3.13.5.1.

And it is written, *even* IESVS (not Christ) *who deliuered vs from the wrath to come* 1 *Thes*. 1.10. and againe *having therefore brethren boldnesse to enter into the holyest, by the blod of* IESVS (not Christ) *Heb*:10.19.

It is written, *while we were yet sinners Christ* (not IESVS) *dyed for vs Rom*. 5.8.

And it is written *if wee beleeue that* IESVS (not Christ) *dyed and rose againe* 1 *Thes*:4.14. 2 *Cor*:4. 10. *Act*.25.19. *Ioh*: 11.51.

You

You goe on and say, if we reflect on Christs exaltation, the scriptures certify vs, *Christ* (not IESVS) *was rayſed againe from the graue* Rom 6.4. *and by his reſurrection all ſhall be raiſed againe at laſt.*

And doth not the ſame ſcripture certify vs that IESVS (not Chriſt) *hath God rayſed: Act:* 2.32. 5. 30. 13.33. *and that with great power gaue the Apoſtles witneſſe of the reſurrection of* IESVS (not Chriſt) *Act.* 4.33. *and* 2 *Cor.* 4.14.

Secondly *that Chriſt* (not IESVS) *was exalted to the right hand of God his Father* Epheſ: 1.20. *and if ye be riſen with Chriſt* (not IESVS) *ſeeke thoſe things which are aboue, where Chriſt* (not IESVS) *ſitteth at the right hand of God.* Coloſſ: 3.1.

And doe we not read alſo this ſame IESVS (not Chriſt) *which is taken vp from you into heauen* Act: 1. 11. and againe *Steven looked vp ſtedfaſtly into heaven and ſaw the glory of God and* IESVS (not Chriſt) *ſtanding on the right hand of God Act:* 7.55.

Thirdly that *God hath quickned vs together with Chriſt* (not IESVS) *and made vs ſit together in heauenly places with Chriſt* (not IESVS) Epheſ. 1.3. 2.5.6.

And it is written likewiſe *if we beleeue that* IESVS (not Chriſt) *dyed and roſe againe even ſo them alſo which ſleepe in* IESVS (not Chriſt) *will God bring with him* 1 Theſ. 4. 14. and againe *knowing that hee which rayſed vp the* Lord IESVS (not Chriſt) *ſhall raiſe vs vp alſo by* IESVS (not Chriſt) 2 Cor. 4.14.

Fourthly, *that God hath gathered together all things in Chriſt* (not IESVS) Epheſ. 1.10. *and that*

Chriſt

Christ (not IESVS) *is all in all* Col.3.11.

And doe we not read, *who is he that overcometh the world but hee that beleueth that* IESVS (not Christ) *is the sonne of God.* 1. Ioh: 5.5. *and whatsoever yee doe in word or in deede doe all in the name of the* Lord IESVS (not Christ) Col.3.17.

Afterwards you tell vs the day of iudgement is stiled the day of Christ and the place of iudgment the iudgment seate of Christ. 2. *Cor*: 5. 10. *Rom*.14.10.

And doe wee not read, *that at that day the* Lord IESVS (not Christ) *shall be revealed from heauen with his mighty Angells* 2 Thes.1.7. and is not that also called the day of the *Lord* IESVS (*not Christ*) 2. Cor.1.14. and againe *deliuer such a one to Sathan for the destruction of the flesh that the spirit may bee saued in the day of the Lord Iesus* (not Christ) 1 Cor. 5.5.

I say I could answere you thus, and that argument can neuer be good or sound that can be thus retorted: but farre be it from me, in any of these places to say *Iesus*, and not *Christ*, and as farre I hope it is from you to thinke, what soeuer you say, that *Christ* did this and that and not *Iesus*. For in all these places where *Christ* is expressed there *Iesus* is implyed, and where *Iesus* is specified, there *Christ* is vnderstood: as *Tertullian* hath long agoe obserued: *whether that* Iesus *be only named, there Christ is vnderstood, because* Iesus *is annointed: or whether* Christ *be onely spoken of, the same also is* Iesus, *because he that is anoynted is* Iesus.

Siue Iesus solummodo positum est intelligitur & Christus, quia Iesus vnctus est siue solummodo Christus, idem est & Iesus. qui vnctus est Iesus ad Prax: cap.28.

But

But the question betweene vs is this, which of these two names *Iesus* or Christ, doe lead vs most of all to his sufferings and sorrowes, and puts vs most in mynde of his bitter death and passion, in which cõsisted the vpshot & perfection of our redemption.

You say the name Christ I say the name IESVS which I haue prooued in my former tract thus.

He was called IESVS, as the word signifieth and the Angell hath giuen the interpretation of it *because he should saue his people from their sinnes*; but how can hee saue his people from their sinnes? goe to another text of scripture and that will tell you *without shedding of blood there is no remission*: you see then how neere of kinne is IESVS, and shedding of blood: and therefore you may perceaue, that this name IESVS, leads vs directly to his bitter death and passion: I can no sooner say *Iesus*, but presently I thinke of dying. And that you may know how neere *Iesus* and dying, sauing and suffering are, the Psalmist will tell you *Psal: 68. 20. He that is our God is the God of Salvation, and vnto God the Lord belong the issues from death*: wherevpon saith Saint *Austin: The reason of this name Iesus is given, for he shall saue his people from their sinnes: For the remission of whose sinnes, because his blood is shed, it behooued him to haue no other parting from this life, but by death: therefore when it was said, Our Lord is a God of salvation, presently it is added and the issues of death belong vnto the Lord, that it might appeare that he must saue vs by dying.*

Mat 1.21.

Heb.9.22.

In quorum peccatorum remissionem quoniam sanguis eius effusus est, non vtiq; oportuit eum de hac vita exitus alios habere quam mortis; ideo cum dictum est, deus noster deus salvos faciendi, continuo subiunctum est & domini exitus mortis vt ostenderetur moriendo salvos esse faciturus de Civ. Dei lib. 17. cap 18.

But as for the name Christ that signifieth no-

thing but annointed, how to be annointed, is a signe of ioy and pleasure, not of sorrow and suffering: looke into his three offices, vnto which he was annointed, to wit, to be a King, Priest, and Prophet: and tell me which of these note vnto vs any dying, or suffering, or paine. A King signifieth one that is ready to rule, a Priest one that is about to offer sacrifice, a Prophet one that can foretell things to come: all these are actiue and honourable names, in all these I can perceaue no signe of death.

Hence it is that the *Iewes* expected a *Christ* for they lookt for a *Messias* and that is no more then *Christ* being interpreted: but doe you thinke they expected one that should suffer and dy? Nothing lesse; they could not, neither can any man els find any such thing in this name *Messias* or Christ: but because IESVS was a suffering and humble name therefore the *Iewes* did not looke for a *Iesus*, as *Tertullian* hath very well observed. For speaking of *Marcion* his *Messias*, *Now* saith he, *if Marcion, like a theevish boy that steales a basket, should catch vp the name* Christ, *yet what colour or pretence could he haue to lay hold vpon the name of* Iesus; *because it was a name the* Iewes *did not so much expect and looke after, for to this day*, saith he, *they looke for a* Christ *not a* Iesus.

Ioh. 1. 41.

Nunc si nomen Christi vt sportulam furunculus captauit, cur etiam Iesus voluit appellari, non tam expectabili apud Iudæos nomine nam ad hodiernum Christum sperant non Iesum. lib. 3. ad Macion. cap. 26.

And here is the difference betweene the perverse and obstinate *Iewes*, and the true beleeuers in the old law: for the first sort lookt for onely a *Messias* or Christ; but the other for a *Iesus*: hence it is Gen. 49. 18. *I will looke for thy sauiour or salvation.* Isa.

12.2. *Behold God my Saviour, and hee is become my saluation.* and ver. 3. *With ioy shall he draw waters out of the wells of saluation.* So Psal. 84. 7. *Shew vs thy mercy O Lord and grant vs thy saluation.* Thus Habacuck. 3. 18. *Yet will I reioyce in the Lord, I will ioy in the God of my saluation*, which S. *Austin* would haue translated thus, *I will reioyce in God my Iesus, which name*, saith he, *is a great deale more sweet, pleasant, ioyous, and comfortable to pronounce.* Thus the blessed Virgin *reioyced in God her Sauiour*, Lu. i. 47. And good old *Simeon* alluding to that place of *Habacuck* saith *Mine eies haue seene thy saluatiō*, Luc. 2 30. *Yea all flesh shall see the saluation of God*, Luc. 3. 6.

Gaudebo in Deo salutari meo.

Melius mihi videntur quidam codices habere gaudebo in Deo Iesu meo, quam hi qui volentes id latinè ponere nomen ipsum nō posuerunt quod est nobis amicius & dulcius nominare. De Civ. Dei. lib. 18. cap. 32.

By this it doth appeare that the name Christ doth not intimate vnto vs his death and passion, because the Iewes who lookt for a Christ, yet little dreamt of any dying or suffering.

But you will say, how then doe we read in Scripture, ought not Christ to haue suffered these things, and thus it behooueth Christ to suffer.

True, and so the Scripture saith, that the Iewes *crucified the Lord of Glory*: so we may say and truly say, that the sonne of God, the Lord of Lords, the King of Kings, the mighty God, the euerlasting Father, the Prince of peace, was crucified: but can wee therefore say, that he was crucified *as*, he was Lord of glory, *as* hee was the sonne of God, *as* hee was Lord of Lords, &c. No by no meanes, for this were little lesse then blasphemy: but we ascribe that to the person of Christ which belongs properly to one of his natures, which the learned call a communicati-

Communicatio Idiomatum.

on of Idioms, when by reason of the hypostaticall vnion, that which belongs properly to one nature, is communicated, not to the other nature, but to the whole person: hence it is, that wee say the Lord of glory was crucified, because that person, who is Lord of glory, was crucified although he was crucifyed, not as he was the Lord of glory, but as he was the sonne of man: On the other side, wee read in scripture, that *the sonne of man hath power on earth to forgiue sinnes*, although he forgiues sinnes, not *as* he is the sonne of man, but *as* he is the son of God.

So here, if you goe to the propriety of the names, Iesus, is a sorrowfull and suffering name: but Christ is a soueraigne and commanding name, yet by reason of this rule it comes to passe, that although Iesus in it selfe, be an all gracious and humble name; and Christ an all glorious and maiesticall name, yet now is Iesus an all glorious and powerfull name, & Christ an all gracious and pittifull name: because he who is Christ is all gracious, and he who is Iesus, is all glorious.

So then, although the same person who is Christ was crucified for vs, yet we cannot so properly and exactly say he was crucified, as he was Christ, for then euery Christ should be crucified; but as he was Christ he was a King, a Priest, and a Prophet, names of honour and dignity, no sorrow, or suffering is included in these names: but I may properly say hee died and suffered as Iesus: Sauiour, and suffering goe neere together in sound and in sense: hee could not saue vs from our sins, without shedding his blood;

therefore

therefore this name Iesus and this alone leads vs directly to the great worke of our saluation.

To make this a little more plaine by a familiar instance, you are a Lawyer and a great writer in divinity: yet as you are a Lawyer, you are not a writer in Diuinity: for then all Lawyers, should be writers in Diuinity; neither as you are a writer in Diuinity are you a Lawyer: for then all writers in Diuinity should be Lawyers: againe you are a Gentleman, & you are also an oppugner of the Church: but as you are a Gentleman, you are not an oppugner of the Church: for then euer Gentleman should be guilty of that fault, which God forbid: neither yet as you are an oppugner of the Church are you a Gentleman; for then euery opposer of the Church should be a Gentleman, but this is not true, for there are too many rusticks fierce enough against the Church.

Prinne.

Pag. 22. You goe on and say, If wee now reflect vpon the names of Cnrist and Iesus as they haue reference to our Saviours * person we shall finde first that our sauiour was buffetted, spit vpon, and derided of the high Priests and Iews by the name of Christ. *Mat*, 26.67.68. not by the name of Iesus, and that they rent their clothes and crucified him, not for that he called himselfe Iesus, but because he said he was Christ the sonne of the liuing God. *Mat.* 26.63.64.65.

* I thinke you would haue said passion.

Answere.

True sir, the Iewes could not endure that hee should be called Christ, for this is the name of Mes-

sias, and a Messias they expected; seeing then they refused him, they could by no meanes bee contented that hee should take vnto him that name; so then they did not esteeme this to be a lowly and despicable name, but they thought this name was too good for him. So that in the place you cite, when the high Priest said, *I adiure thee by the liuing God that thou tell vs whether thoube the Christ the sonne of God*; & our Sauiour had confessed it, the high Priest rent his clothes, saying, he hath spoken blasphemy: as if he should say, this is a name which is too high for him, and therefore this stirred him vp not so much to mocking, scoffing, and deriding, as to envy, hatred, malice, and misusage of him; which broke out you see into spitting in his face, into buffetting him, and smiting him with the palmes of their hands: but we shall finde him more derided by the name of *Iesus* then of Christ. Thus the Iewes, *Is not this Iesus* (not Christ) *the sonne of Ioseph, whose Father & Mother we know, how is it then that he saith I came downe from heauen:* hereupon in scorne this name was put ouer his head *this is Iesus* (not Christ) *the King of the Iewes.* Thus the chiefe Priests mocking him with the Scribes and Elders alluding to this name *Iesus*, said, *hee saued others himselfe hee cannot saue.* Therefore *Marlorat* saith, that *the Iewes in scorne and derision to this day call our Sauiour not* Iesus *but* Iesu, *which with them signifieth onely some common and contemptible fellow.* So that you see this name Christ caused indeed our Sauiour to suffer much, not that the name it selfe is a suffering name, but

Ioh 6.42.

Mat.27.42.

Iudæi irrisione vocant nostrum Jesum יש יו *Iesu quod illius nihil nisi vulgarem hominē significare videtur* יהושע *qd significat saluatorem. In cap.1 Mat. ver.21.*

but because the Iewes thought this name was misapplied, and therefore made him to suffer for arrogating that to himselfe which they thought did not of right belong vnto him; so we read that the Iewes went about to stone Christ, and they gaue this reason for it, because, as they said, *hee being a man made himselfe a God*; shall we therefore say that God is a suffering and sorrowfull name in it selfe: But if you will goe to a name that leads directly to sorrow and suffering, to humility and lowlinesse; then it must be the name *Iesus*, as I haue proued before. And the Apostle doth not obscurely intimate the same, when he saith, *alwaies carrying about in my body the dying of the Lord Iesus*, 2.Cor.4.10. where though the vulgar readeth the dying of the Lord Iesus Christ, yet the originall hath no more but this, the dying of the Lord Iesus (not Christ) as if he should say his dying leads vs to his name Iesus: which is a dying name (as I observed before out of the Psalmist) where the originall word is very emphaticall as *Beza* hath well obserued: *I*, saith he, *if it were lawfull for me to leaue S. Pauls words, would rather expound it the slaughter or killing then the dying of the* Lord Iesus, *because Christ is here to bee considered of vs not as simply dead, but slaine or murthered, but this word* νεκρωσις, saith he, *doth here signifie neither death nor slaughter, but that poore and despicable condition of Christ, subiect, and in danger of continuall dying: lastly it noteth vnto vs his great weaknesse and infirmity which word the Apostle vseth when he speaketh of* Saras *wombe that was past bearing children, he calleth it, the dead-*

νέκρωσιν τῆς μήτρας σαρρας.

nesse

nesse or weaknesse of Saras *wombe*. Rom. 4. 19.

Prinne.

Secondly, that the Scripture when it speakes of our Saviours sufferings, doth alwaies style them the sufferings of Christ not of Iesus. 1. *Pet.* 4. 13. 14. *cap.* 5. 1. 2. 21. 3. 17. 18. 2. *Cor.* 1. 5. 6. 7. *Col.* 1. 24. *&* *Act.* 26. 22. 23.

Answere.

I, doth the Scripture alwaies stile our Sauiours sufferings, the sufferings of Christ not *Iesus*: doe we not somewhere read, that S. Paul *reioyced in the crosse of our Lord Iesus Christ*; and doe we not read *of the oblation of the body of Iesus Christ*. Heb. 10. 10. *And the sprinkling of the blood of Iesus Christ*. 1. Pet. 1. 2. *And that the blood of Iesus Christ his son cleanseth vs from all sinne*. 1. Ioh. 1. 7. You see here, when mention is made of Christs suffering, that *Iesus* is named, as wel as *Christ*. Yea doth not the scripture sometimes stile them the sufferings of *Iesus* (not of *Christ*?) What thinke you of this place? *From henceforth let no man trouble mee for I beare in my body the markes of the Lord Iesus* (not Christ): And that to the Hebrewes Wherefore *Iesus also* (not Christ) *that he might sanctifie the people, with his owne blood, suffered without the gate*: and againe, *hauing therefore brethren boldnesse to enter into the holiest, by the blood of Iesus* (not Christ:) *And we see Iesus* (not Christ) *who was made a little lower then the Angells for suffering death, crowned with glory and honour*. So likewise Mar. 16. 6. *The Angell said vnto the women, be not affrighted,*

Gal. 6. 14.

Gal. 6. 17.

Heb. 13. 12.

Heb. 10. 19.

Heb. 2. 9.

yee

yee seeke Iesus (not Christ) *of Nazareth which was crucified.*

Yea, were I disposed to argue as you doe, I could more easily perswade my reader, that the sufferings of our Sauiour were the sufferings of *Iesus* and (not Christ:) for doe but consult the Evangelists, who write of his passion and there we shall finde that the Priests and Elders *tooke counsell against* IESVS (not Christ) *to put him to death*, & the same chiefe *Priests and Elders perswaded the multitude that they should ask Barrabas and destroy* IESVS (not Christ) *and after that, Pilate released vnto them Barrabas and scourged* IESVS (not Christ) Hence one of the officers, *which stood by, stroke* IESVS, not Christ, *with the palme of his hand*, and in another place, *the Iewes did persecute* IESVS (not Christ) *and sought to slay him*. Thus Ioh. 19 5. *then came* IESVS (not Christ) *forth, wearing the crowne of thornes, and the purple robe*: Hence Luke 23.25.26. *They laid the Crosse on Simon a Cyrenian to beare it after* IESVS (not Christ) *where Pilate delivered* IESVS (not Christ) *to their will*. Thus the two maids said vnto *Peter, thou also wast with* IESVS (not Christ) *of Nazareth*, Mat. 26. 69. 71. Thus Pilate *willing to content the people, released Barrabas vnto them, and deliuered* IESVS (not Christ) *when he had scourged him to be crucified*, Mark. 15. 15.

Mat. 27. 1. 20. 26. Mark. 14. 55.

Ioh. 18. 22.

Ioh. 5. 16.

To come a little neerer to our Saviours death, *At Golgotha they crucified him, and two other with him on either side one, and* IESVS (not Christ) *in the midst* Ioh. 19. 18. *Now there stood by the Crosse of* IESVS (not Christ) *his mother and his sisters*, Ioh. 19. 25.

At the ninth houre IESVS (not Christ) *cryed with a loud voice, Eloi, Eloi: &c.* Mark. 15. 34. and vers. 37. IESVS (not Christ) *cried with a loud voice and gaue vp the Ghost.* And againe, *when* IESVS (not Christ) *had receiued the vineger he said, it is finished,* Ioh. 19. 30. and remarkable aboue all is his accusation written ouer his head: *this is* IESVS (not Christ) *The king of the Iewes.* Mat. 27. 37. And after his death every where the Evangelists call his body, the body of IESVS (not Christ) Thus Ioseph of Arimathea, *being a Disciple of* IESVS (not Christ) *besought Pilate that he might take the body of* IESVS (not Christ) Ioh. 19. 38. 40. 42. and Ioh. 20. 12. *Two Angels sate where the body of Iesus* (not Christ) *had layen,* Luk. 24. 3. Mat. 27. 58.

Thus, after the resurrection *feare not*, saith the Angell to the women, *for I knowe that you seeke Iesus* (not Christ) *which was crucified,* Mat. 28. 5. Mark. 16 6. And were I disposed, I could weary out my reader, rather then giue him satisfaction, with these and the like quotations: but in these and the like places, as I haue said, when *Iesus* is named, Christ is vnderstood, and when Christ is specified, Iesus is implied. Yet this name IESVS doth more fully and emphatically expresse vnto vs his bitter death and sufferings, then the name Christ, as I haue proued before.

Prynne.

Thirdly, that the Saints which suffer hatred or persecution for our Sauiours sake; doe suffer for him as he is stiled Christ not Iesus: witnesse 1. *Cor.* 4. 9. 10. 11. *Wee are made a spectacle*

cle vnto the world, and to Angels, and to men: Wee are fooles for Christ [not Iesus] *sake: We are weake, we are dispised, wee are naked, persecuted, reviled, buffetted,* And 2. Cor. 12. 10. *Therefore I take pleasure in infirmities, in reproches, in necessities, in persecutions, in distresses for Christ* [not Iesus] *sake.* Witnesse Ioh. 19. 22. *Where the Iewes agreed, that if any did confesse that our Saviour was Christ* [not Iesus] *he should bee put out of the Synagogue.* and Mat. 24. 9. *They shall deliver you vp to be afflicted, and shall kill you, and yee shall be hated of all Nations for my Names sake.* And what name is this? If any, then certainely the name of Christ, not Iesus. Witnesse verse 5. *Many shall come in my name, saying, I am Christ:* and vers. 23. 24. *If any man shall say vnto you Loe, here is Christ, or there, beleeue it not: For there shall arise false Christs, &c.* Hence Heb: 11. 24. *Wee haue mention of the reproch of Christ,* [not Iesus] Hence Col. 1. 24. *St: Paul* writes, *That he did fill vp that which is behinde of the afflictions of Christ* [not Iesus] *in his flesh.* Hence *Phil.* 2. 13. hee stiles his fetters, his *bonds in Christ* [not Iesus] and ver. 20. 21. *Christ shall be magnified in my body,* that is, in my corporall sufferings for him; *For to me to liue is Christ* [not Iesus] Yea hence both *Paule* and *Peter* (as if they had purposely written to resolue this point) informes vs: *Phil.* 1. 29. *That it is giuen to vs in the behalfe of Christ* [not Iesus] *not onely to beleeue on him, but also to suffer for his sake.* And 1. Pet. 4. 13. 14. 16. *That if we be reproached for the name of Christ* [not Iesus] *happy are we, inasmuch as we are partakers of Christs sufferings. Therefore,* (saith he) *if any man suffer as a Christian* (deriued only from the name of Christ) *let him not bee ashamed.* The name therefore of Christ [not Iesus] was the name in which *Christ and Christians suffered most reproach, contempt and persecution:* and for this name did the Martyres alwayes suffer in the primitiue Church; as the recited Scriptures and Ecclesiasticall stories testifie.

Answere.

This is not true neither, for wee read sometimes that both IESVS and Christ are ioyned together, where there is speech of the suffering of Saints, as 2.Tim.2.3. *Thou therefore endure affliction as a good Souldier of Iesus Christ*, and Philemon, v.1.9. *Wee read of Paule a prisoner of Iesus Christ*. Thus Ephes. 3.1. *I Paul a prisoner of Iesus Christ*. Nay there are not wanting places to proue that the Saints suffer for him as he is stiled IESVS (not Christ) Witnesse 2.Cor.4.11. *We which liue, are alwaies deliuered to death for* IESVS (not Christ) *sake, that the life also of* IESVS (not Christ) *might bee made manifest in our mortall body*. Hence Act.5.40. *The Apostles departed from the Councell, reioycing that they were counted worthy to suffer shame for his name*. And in the verse going before, you shall knowe what this name is, *They were beaten*, saith the Text, *& commanded, that they should not speak in the name of* IESVS (not Christ) Thus Act.9.5. When our Sauiour would personate the sufferings of his Church and children, he doth not say vnto *Saul*, I am Christ, *but I am* IESVS *whom thou persecutest*: and againe Act. 22. 8. *I am* IESVS (not Christ) *of Nazareth whom thou persecutest*. Hence it is that S. Iohn in the Reuelation saw the *woman drunken with the blood of the martyres of* IESVS (not Christ) Reuel.17.6. And againe Reuel. 20.4. *He saw the soules of them that were beheaded for the witnesse of Iesus* (not Christ.) But as I said, these things are spoken indifferently, sometime of

So Act.26.15.

Iesus

Iesus, and at other times of Christ: to shew, that it is the same person, sometimes expressed by one name, sometime by another: neither from these places can there be any firme conclusion gathered, that this suffering belongs to one name, more then to another.

THe third thing conſiderable, and worth the examining is pag: 25.&c. where you make a large compariſon betweene the name IESVS and the name Chriſt and goe about to proue by ſome vnanſwereable arguments (as you are pleaſed to ſtile them) that the name Chriſt, is more glorious, and more to be reverenced, then the name IESVS: your words are theſe. *I ſhall here propound ſome vnanſwerable arguments to proue* that the name of IESVS, *is not more honorable, more worthy cappe and knee, yea not ſo eminent, ſo glorious, and not ſo venerable among Chriſtians, as the name Chriſt.*

I for my part, am ſorry there is a cõpariſon made between theſe to names; let them ſay one to another as *Abraham* ſaid to *Lot*: let their be no ſtrife, I pray thee, between me and thee, for we are brethren, Brethren I ſay they are both belonging to the ſame perſon; & they like loving brethren commonly go both together: for how often ſhall we read in ſcripture theſe two [IESVS *Chriſt*] go hand in hand. Yet as amongſt brethren there is an elder and a yonger, ſo here, the elder is (IESVS) and therefore commonly Gen. 13. 8.

ſet

set first but the younger is (*Christ*) and therefore is to come after, as shall appeare anon. But I wonder how it comes to passe that this name (*Christ*) is in so great request with you: In your former tract, you reckoned vp mãy glorious names which you would haue to bee preferred before IESVS but not a word to proue this name Christ, to be so excellent. This name (*Lord*) was then the greatest and most honorable name you could thinke on. Since which time it seemes some freinds of yours haue bestowed these notes vpon you about the name Christ, and now these also must come forth: and let vs heare what they be; your first vnanswerable argument is this.

I haue more reason to say so then for you to say I crossed many things out of Mr. *Widdowes* his booke.

Prynne.

First the name Iesus is onely a *proper Personall name*, imposed on our Saviour, to distinguish him from other men: whereas the name Christ, is a *name of office*, including all his seuerall *offices of King, Priest and Prophet, to which he was anoynted*: As therefore the names of *Emperour, King, Prince, Earle, Lord-Keeper, &c.* are farre more honourable then the names of *Henrie, Charles, Iohn, Thomas, &c.* which are common to the meanest subiects; because the first are titles of honour and office; the other onely ordinary proper names imposed for distinction sake. Even so must the name of Christ, a name of office, of vnction, be far more honourable than Iesus; a name though *originally deriued from the office of a Saviour*, yet imposed vnto him at his natiuity as a proper name, to difference him from other men.

Answere.

You say well, that IESVS is his proper name, for goe

goe to the Evangelist, and he will tell you, that the Angell from God would haue him called IESVS (not Christ) and therefore *vers.* 25. *Ioseph* called his name IESVS: yea so proper it is, that it is not communicated to others, as I shall shew anon, and so proper, that I can scarce call this attribute *Christ*, a name: you may more truely call it a title of honour, an appellation, and indeed our Saviour had many mo of them, as to bee called *Lord* of *Lords*, *Prince* of *Peace*, the everlasting *Father*, head of the *Church*, *Mediator*, *&c.* not that we can so properly call these his names, as titles of honour and dignity: not that he had so many names, as one saith, but that he had so many things belonging to him that required these appellatiōs. And therefore *Tertullian* long agoe will hardly admit wee should call this a name; For speaking against the Heretick Praxeas, *very foolishly saith he, thou makest the Father to be Christ, for thou dost not sufficiently looke into the force and efficacy of this name, if so bee that Christ bee a name, and not rather an appellation; for by* Christ *is signified* anoynted: *now to be anoynted is no more a name, then to be clothed, or shod, a thing meerly accident to a name*; and after that, speaking of these two names, he saith, *one of them is his name, giuen him by the Angell, the other is but an accident proceedinge from his vnction.* Thus Lactantius *our Saviour is commonly called* IESVS *amongst men, for Christ is no proper name, but an appellation of power and of his Kingdome.*

And so St. *Chrysostome*, *Christ and Lord* saith he, *are*

Mat. 1. 21.

Non quod tot nomina sed quot res habiturus esset. Itaq; christum facis patrem stultissime qui nec ipsam vim inspicias nominis huius si tamen nomen est christus & non appellatio potius, vnctus enim significatur, vnctus autem non magis nomē est, quam vestitus quam calceatus, accidens nomini res. Tertul: adver: Prax, c. 28. Quorum nominum alterum est proprium quod ab angelo impositum est alterum accidens quod ab vnctione provenit.

Iesus inter homines nominatur nā Christus non proprium nomen est, sed nuncupatio potestatis & regni lib. 4 divin. institut. cap 7.

Christus & Dominus, non substantiæ nomina sunt sed dignitatis, alterum potentiæ alterum vnctionis. in cap. 1. Ioan hom. 2. *Cognomen non prænomen.*

are not proper and substantiall names but dignities, the one of his power, the other of his vnction. So then, you keepe a great coile about a name, which will hardly proue a name, being throughly examined.

But let it be a name a surname as we say no forename. I answere secondly, that you proceede vpon a wrong ground of our reuerence, as you did in his other titles of Lord of Lords, King of Kings, &c. thinking as the world doth, that wee shew this honour vnto great high and powerfull names, whereas God is more delighted with names of pitty and mercy, then of power and maiesty, and so should we also more honour these titles, especially when this mercy and favour extends it selfe vnto vs, as it doth very graciously and plentifully in this name IESVS.

Thirdly, you distinguish betweene a proper personall name, and a name of office, as though *Iesus* were not a name of office, yea of the greatest office that euer was done for mankind: and this you confesse here, that this name *Iesus* is originally deriued from the office of a Saviour; from whence I argue thus; that name is more excellent, which is both a proper name & a name of office also, then that which is onely a name of office: but IESVS is a proper personal name, & a name of office also, as you confesse; this name Christ onely a name of office, the conclusion will then follow, that this name IESVS must needs be more excellent, & honourable then Christ.

Fourthly your comparison is not well made vnlesse

lesse the names of *Charles*, *Thomas*, *Iohn*, &c. doe signifie some tearmes of favour and benefit vnto vs, as you know the name IESVS doth. So then, let the comparison stand thus, betweene these names of *Emperour*, *Prince*, *Lord keeper*; and betweene these names, *Founder*, *Benefactor*, *Patron*, *defender*, *deliverer*, or the like: then tell me, to which of these names we owe most reverence or respect: For although those former names names are much to be honoured and respected by vs, because they signify such vnto vs, as be in great place and dignity: yet, doe but ioyne some of these relations to them, as the King my *benefactor*, or the Lord Keeper my *patron*, you are not ignorant how great an addition of hearty respect and dutifull obedience they bring along with them. And say what you will, for all your great titles, they be these relations, especially those of favour and benefite, which beare all the sway in the world.

For to come a little closer to you, because you instance in these familiar names; let me giue you a familiar instance. Wee ought all of vs greatly to honour and reverence our most gracious King and soveraigne both with soule and body, as our common Parent, by whom vnder God, wee enioy all our peace wealth and safety. But suppose one should commit some outrage, to wit, kill a man, through the distempered passions of his fierce anger. Yet such is the rigour of the law, that he must dy for it. If the King now, out of his princely compassion and clemency, should send him a pardon, and so re-

Christus & Dominus, non substantiæ nomina sunt sed dignitatis, alterum potentiæ alterum vnctionis. in cap. 1. Ioan hom. 2. *Cognomen non prænomen.*

are not proper and substantiall names but dignities, the one of his power, the other of his vnction. So then, you keepe a great coile about a name, which will hardly proue a name, being throughly examined.

But let it be a name a surname as we say no forename. I answere secondly, that you proceede vpon a wrong ground of our reuerence, as you did in his other titles of Lord of Lords, King of Kings, &c. thinking as the world doth, that wee shew this honour vnto great high and powerfull names, whereas God is more delighted with names of pitty and mercy, then of power and maiesty, and so should we also more honour these titles, especially when this mercy and favour extends it selfe vnto vs, as it doth very graciously and plentifully in this name IESVS.

Thirdly, you distinguish betweene a proper personall name, and a name of office, as though *Iesus* were not a name of office, yea of the greatest office that euer was done for mankind: and this you confesse here, that this name *Iesus* is originally deriued from the office of a Saviour; from whence I argue thus; that name is more excellent, which is both a proper name & a name of office also, then that which is onely a name of office: but IESVS is a proper personal name, & a name of office also, as you confesse; this name Christ onely a name of office, the conclusion will then follow, that this name IESVS must needs be more excellent, & honourable then Christ.

Fourthly your comparison is not well made vnlesse

lesse the names of *Charles*, *Thomas*, *Iohn*, &c. doe signifie some tearmes of favour and benefit vnto vs, as you know the name IESVS doth. So then, let the comparison stand thus, betweene these names of *Emperour*, *Prince*, *Lord keeper*; and betweene these names, *Founder*, *Benefactor*, *Patron*, *defender*, *deliverer*, or the like: then tell me, to which of these names we owe most reverence or respect: For although those former names names are much to be honoured and respected by vs, because they signify such vnto vs, as be in great place and dignity: yet, doe but ioyne some of these relations to them, as the King my *benefactor*, or the Lord Keeper my *patron*, you are not ignorant how great an addition of hearty respect and dutifull obedience they bring along with them. And say what you will, for all your great titles, they be these relations, especially those of favour and benefite, which beare all the sway in the world.

For to come a little closer to you, because you instance in these familiar names; let me giue you a familiar instance. Wee ought all of vs greatly to honour and reverence our most gracious King and soveraigne both with soule and body, as our common Parent, by whom vnder God, wee enioy all our peace wealth and safety. But suppose one should commit some outrage, to wit, kill a man, through the distempered passions of his fierce anger. Yet such is the rigour of the law, that he must dy for it. If the King now, out of his princely compassion and clemency, should send him a pardon, and so re-

deeme him out of the iawes of death: who can imagine how that honour, duty, reverence, and respect, which before he shewed vnto him onely as a soueraigne, will now bee enlarged and extended towards him as a saviour also: Certainely if hee bowed the knee to him before, he would now fall prostrate on the ground; this is our case.

To giue you another instance, because you tell vs you haue beene sometimes of *Oriell Colledge*, I vnderstand that you haue a double relatiõ to them: The one is in that they haue beene your gouernors; the other is, in that they are your Landlords. Now I thinke you honour and respect them as they were your gouernors: but let me tell you in your eare, you doe honour, reverence, loue, yea and feare them also, ten times more, because they are your Landlords: And had Mr *Widdowes* beene now an actuall fellow of that auncient and worthy society as he hath beene heretofore, I make no question but you would haue giuen him more respect, then to call him nonsense foole, asse, madman, animall, frantick, brainesick, & all to nought, words fitter for children to vse, when they play and fall out in the streets, then for those who professe themselues great Clerks, and famous writers.

Prinne.

Secondly, That name which is peculiar to our Saviour as a Sauiour, is more honorable than that which is common to him with other men. But the name Christ, is a name *peculiar to our Saviour as a Saviour*: none euer being stiled Christ

christ in Scripture, but he alone. Whereas the name Iesus was common vnto others, viz. To *Iesus the sonne of Nun, Heb.*4.8 To *Iesus surnamed Iustus*, Collos.4.11. To *Iesus the sonne of Iosedech, Hag.*11. *Ezra* 3.2. To *Iesus the sonne of Sirach, The prologue and title to Ecclesiasticus*, and to others. Therefore it is more honourable than Iesus.

Answere.

The learned Bishop argueth cleane contrary and taking your proposition to bee true as it is, denies your assumption, for *Christ*, saith he, *is communicated by God the Father vnto others, namely to Princes, so is not* IESVS, *that is propper, ego sum & præter me non est alius*, Isa.43.11. *I euen I am the Lord and besides me there is no Saviour*. And he saith very truely, for first the question is not as I haue told you elsewhere, *who* is called *Iesus* or Christ in Scripture, but who *gaue* them these names, for men may call their children what names they please, but wee enquire whether God the Father hath bestowed this name Iesus vpon any other, then his deare sonne our blessed Sauiour: but the name Christ, hee hath communicated to Princes *as touch not my Christs and doe my Prophets no harme*, and in another place. *Thus saith the Lord to his Christ or his annointed Cyrus*. In both which places the originall word being *Messias*, which is by interpretation Christ, the septuagint doth well render it by χριστος, and the Latine by *Christus*, Christ, annointed; where you must obserne that Princes are not onely called Christs, but the Lord calleth them *his* Christs, as being so by his making, his naming, and his appointment:

Pag.476.

Nolite tangere Christos meos. 1 Chron.16. 22.

Isa 45.3.

for how often shall we read in the Scripture, that Princes are called *Christi Domini* the Lords Christs or annointed. *Behold* saith *Samuell here I am, witnesse against me before the Lord and before his Christ or annointed*, and againe, *the Lord is witnesse against*
1 Sam.12.3.5. *you and his Christ is witnesse this day*. Thus *David*
24.6. saith *the Lord forbid that I should doe this thing vnto my Maister the Lords annointed to stretch forth myne hand against him, seeing he is the annointed of Lord*: and so vers.10. *I will not put forth my hand against my Lord, for he is the Lords annointed*. Thus
26.9.11. *David* to *Abishai, destroy him not, for who can stretch forth his hand against the Lords annointed, and be*
2 Sam.1.14. *guiltlesse*. Thus *David* to the *Amalakite how wast thou not afraid to stretch forth thine hand to destroy the Lords annointed*, and vers.16. *thy mouth hath testifyed against thee, saying I haue slaine the Lords an-*
19.22. *nointed*. Thus *Abishai, shall not Shimei be put to death for this, because he cursed the Lords anointed*. Thus
22.51. *David* singeth, *he is the towre of salvation for his*
23. *King & sheweth mercy to his annointed, vnto* David
1 Cor.16.22. *and to his seede for euer*. Thus God himselfe saith, *touch not mine vnnointed and doe my prophets no*
Psal.18.15. *harme*. Thus *Psal.20.6. now know I that the Lord*
Psal.105.15. *saueth his annointed and againe* Psal.89.38. *but thou hast cast off and abhorred, thou hast beene wroth with thine annointed*. And Psal.132.10. *for thy servant* Davids *sake, turne not away the face of thine annointed*. And thus God himselfe Psal.132.17. *there will I make the horne of David to bud I haue ordayned a lampe for mine annointed*. In all which places though

though we english them by this word annointed, because it is the signification of Christ, yet may we read them (*Christ*) insteede of annointed, because the originall word is *Messiah* which is well rendred by the Septuagint χριστος &by the vulgar *Christus*. In all which places you see Princes are not onely called Christs, but the Lords Christs or the annointed of the Lord. How is it then that you affirme thus boldly, that none euer was stiled Christ in Scripture, but our Saviour alone.

Much lesse is this name peculiar to our Saviour as a Saviour, and you tell vs, for although the same person is both Christ and a Saviour, yet as hee is Christ he is not a Saviour; mistake mee not, as though I went about to make IESVS & Christ two persons, but onely this I say, that this word Christ in his largest extent of signification, doth not comprehend in it this office of sauing vs. For first Christ signifieth no more but annointed, now what affinity is there betweene annointing and sauing, the one being a signe of gladnesse and chearfulnesse, the other implying nothing but sorrow and suffering, for the Iewes lookt for a Christ to rule and raigne ouer them, but not for a IESVS that should dy for them, and saue them from their sinnes. Nay, if you take the end and scope of this anointing, to wit, to be King, Priest, and Prophet: neither doe any of these words containe in them a Sauiour: for they be all of them glorious and actiue words; but to be a IESVS, a Sauiour, is a passiue and painefull name. For if, as he was Priest hee had beene a Saviour, then

Ex vi nominis.

then had all the Priests of the old law beene Saviours: Priest, notes no more then a sacrificer, one that offers sacrifice: but before we haue a Saviour, wee must haue a sacrifice also: which it pleased him to be by being a IESVS, for *without shedding of blood there is no remission of sinnes*; no IESVS, no Saviour, without suffering, nay the very chiefe act of sauing consisted in suffering.

But on the other side, whom shall we find in scripture besides Christ that was called IESVS by God himsefe: we read there indeede, as you say of Iesus the sonne of *Nun*, but was he called *Iesus Domini* the *Lords Iesus?* There is also Iesus the sonne of *Sirach*, and Iesus surnamed *Iustus*: but can you find, that any of those was called *Iesus Domini* the *Lords Iesus*, so called and named by God himselfe. Onely our blessed Saviour at his circumcision, was called Iesus, and that you may not thinke this name was giuen him by men, the text tells you presently after that *he was named so of the Angell before hee was conceaued in the wombe*, he it is, who is not onely *Iesus Domini*, the *Lords Iesus*, but *Iesus Dominus Iesus the Lord.*

Luke 2.21.

Prinne.

Thirdly, that name which was giuen to christ in regard of his incarnation & humanity onely is not so excellent, so venerable, as that which is attributed to him in respect of both his natures. But the name, Iesus, was giuen to our Saviour in regard of his incarnation and humanity onely: *Mat.* 1.21.25. *Luke* 1.31. *c.*2. 21. Whereas his name

name

name Christ, was giuen him in respect of both his natures: *Acts* 10 38. *Hebr.* 1.8.9. See here page 21. 22. & *Ursini Catech:purs* 2, *Quest*: 31.*p*:204. not so excellent, so venerable as his name Christ.

Answere.

The learned B. againe argueth quite contrary, and saith that Christ is not, cannot bee the name of God, God cannot bee anoynted: but IESVS is the name of God, and the cheife name of God; and he saith truely. For first, Christ is not the name of our Sauiour as he is God: for Christ signifieth no more but anoynted, now God, as he is God, cannot be anoynted, for nothing can bee anoynted, but that which is corporeall. And thus *Tertullian* doth proue very well that the name of Christ could not agree to him, whome the hereticke *Marcion* called Christ *For if he be Christ saith he then he is anoynted for to be anoynted, is a property of the body, he that had no body, could not at all be anoynted, and hee that could not be anoynted, could by no meanes bee called Christ.*

Pag. 476.

Si enim Christus, vnctus est, vngi vti q, corporis passio est, qui corpus non habuit, vngi omnino non potuit, qui vngi omnino non potuit, Christus vocari nullo modo potuit Tertul. lib 3. ad Martion cap. 15.

But you vrge scripture to proue it. *Act.* 10.38. where *we read that God anoynted* IESVS *of Nazareth with the holy Ghost, and with power who went about doing good, and healing all that were possessed with Devills* for God *was with him.* What then? therefore doth this name Christ note vnto vs his divinity? I cannot perceiue how this conclusion can follow from those words; much lesse doth it follow from that other text *Heb.* 1. 8. 9. *thou hast loued*

righteousnesse and hated iniquity therefore God euen thy God hath annointed thee with the oile of Gladnesse aboue thy fellowes. What then? Therefore doth this name Christ notifie his death? But it is sufficient to you to vrge the Scripture, so you be quoting places, you care not whether they bee to purpose or no.

But you will proue it out of *Aquinas*, but *Aquinas* saies not that the name Christ doth signify both natures, *dat intelligere vtramq; naturam, it giues vs to vnderstand both the natures*, for if we say anointed (& the name Christ signifieth no more) we must vnderstand that there is some that doth annoynt; and this is all that *Irenæus* will haue. In Christs name he saith is vnderstood, *or implyed or intimated both he that anoynteth; and hee that is annoynted, and the oyntment it selfe wherewith he is annointed*, and he saith true, for when we heare of one that is annointed, wee must presently conceaue, that there is one that must annoynt, and something wherewith to annoint, what is this to the purpose, therefore doth this word or name Christ note vnto vs the deity?

In Christi nomen subauditur qui vnxit & ipse qui vnctus est & ipsa vnctio in qua vnctus est significans & vngentem patrem, & vnctum filium, & vnctionem, qui est spiritus. Iren. lib. 2. cap. 29.

You see then, that if you goe no farther then to the extent of the name Christ, you can neuer wring out of it the deity, and therefore for you to call B. *Andrews* absurd if not hereticall, for saying so as you doe pag. 27. in the margent, sheweth but the heat of your passion; let him alone M. *Prinne*: shoote not arrowes against the sonne, he will be famous

mous and renowned when you and I shall not bee thought of.

But the name IESVS, you say was giuen to our Saviour in regard of his incarnation and humility onely, and for this you bring places to no purpose also. For doth not this name note vnto vs as much as the Angell testified in those places you cite, *thou shalt call his name* Iesus *for he shall saue his people from their sinnes*; and can that name which signifieth sauing people from our sinnes, note vnto vs the humanity of Christ onely, what did his humanity onely saue vs from our sinnes? or doth not this rather note vnto vs his deity? for *who can forgiue sinnes but God alone?* What saith *Chrysologus*, *that it is God who forgiueth sinnes, if you beleeue not Christians beleeue O Infidell the very Iewes saying when thou art a man, thou makest thy selfe a God*, for who can forgiue sinnes but God alone. *Ioh.* 10.

Esse deum qui peccata condonet si Christianis non credis crede infidelissime vel Iudeis dicentibus cum sis homo facis te ipsum deum quis potest peccata dimittere nisi solus Deus. Ser. 145.

And therefore St *Chrysostome* saith well *he is called Christ as deriuing his name from vnction, but he is called* Iesus *a Lordly name*, that is one who is God as well as man; which speech though Saint *Austin* mislike and retract, yet he thinketh that it may bee vsed in a good sense, for he is more properly called *homo Dominus*, then *homo Dominicus*, a man who is Lord himselfe, then a Lordly man.

Christus dictus est ab vnctione nomen derivans Iesus dictus est homo dominicus. Chrysost. hom de crute.

Lib. primo. retract: cap. 19.

Trinne.

Fourthly, That name, which doth difference our Saviour from all others who were called Iesus, and giue him an excellency, a precedency aboue them all, must needs be

more venerable and excellent than the name Iesus onely, which doth not simply of it selfe either distinguish or advance our Saviour aboue all others of that name. But this name Christ doth distinguish our Saviour from all others who were Stiled Iesus, and giues him an excellency, a precedency aboue them all. Witnesse, *Mat.* 1.16. *Of whom was borne Iesus which is called Christ.* *Luke* 2.11. *Vnto you is borne a Iesus, or Saviour, which is Christ the* Lord. *Mat.* 27.17. *Iesus which is called* Christ, *Acts* 2.36. *Let all the house of Israell know assuredly, that God hath made the same Iesus whom you haue crucified both Lord & Christ.* *Acts* 17.3: & 18.5.28. *Paul preached and testified both to the Iewes and Gentiles, and convinced them mightily, that Iesus was the Christ.* 1. *Iohn.* 2.22. *Who is a lyar, but he who denieth that Iesus is the Christ?* 1 *Iohn.* 5.1. *Whosoeuer beleeueth that Iesus is the Christ, is borne of God.* *Iohn* 20.31. *These things are written that ye might beleeue that Iesus is the Christ the sonne of God, and that beleeuing ye might haue life through his name.* All which doe likewise imply, that Christ, is a title of office, more honourable by farre than the bare name of Iesus: Ergo it must needs be more venerable and excellent than the name Iesus is.

Answere.

Your argument is this, the name Christ is more excellent and more eminent then the name *Iesus*, and therefore more venerable and more to be reverenced of vs. I haue often denyed this argument, and will not be afraid to deny it still, for you, (as the world) thinke nothing so much to be esteemed as that which is high, excellent, and great in it selfe: But it is otherwise with God, he preferrs goodnesse before greatnesse: he esteemes names of mercy

and

and pitty, aboue names of Maiesty and power, and so should we, especially when this mercy and tender compassion extends thus to vs, to our euerlasting good.

For to keepe to your owne familiar instance, Lord-keeper, is a name of greater honour & excellency, dignity, and precedency, then this name Patron; yet who knowes not, that there is more true, harty and vnfained reverence done vnto him, as he is a Patron, then as he is a Lord-keeper: and whosoeuer is his Chaplaine will pray for him but coldly, till he can say my very good Lord and Patron.

But your mind runnes all vpon maiesty, dominion, power, and glory; and this makes you so much magnifie the name Christ; you are like the mother of *Zebedees* children, who could thinke of nothing, but to haue her sonnes to sit, one on the right hand, and the other on the left hand of Christ in his kingdome: and this was the very errour and mistake of the Iewes; they lookt not for a IESVS, but for a Messias a Christ.

But the case is farre otherwise with humble and penitent sinners; all their desire is to be freed from the burthen and waight of their grieuous transgressions and iniquities, and therefore their minde is altogether fixed on a IESVS, a Sauiour, one that should saue them from their sinnes.

Were it not a strange thing for a prisoner, that is bound in chaines and fetters, and lies in a dark dungeon, ready now to be hanged for his outrages, to thinke of honour and preferment; to imagine him-

selfe to be a king, and to enioy his hearts content: would not any man say, that hee were in a dreame: were he wise, he would first bethinke himselfe how to saue his life, & free himselfe from the bondage of slauery, wherein he is. And when this is brought to passe, then he may thinke of aduancing himselfe to some high dignity.

This is our case, we, like miserable men, lye tyed and bound with the chaines of our sinnes; and by reason of these sinnes, are in danger of euerlasting death both of body and soule: we are that wounded man, that haue fallen among theeues, and ly weltring in our owne blood: all our desire is to haue a good Samaritan to binde vp our wounds, and poure in Wine and Oyle, and to take care of vs: you that be whole, need not this Physitian, but wee that are sick: we are that lost groat, that wandering sheepe, that prodigall sonne, that haue spent all our substance vpon harlots and riotous liuing. Shall wee, I say, in this case, thinke of honour, and glory, and maiesty, and raigning with Christ: no, let vs in all humility bewaile our misery, acknowledge our faults; let vs with the prodigall sonne, goe vnto our Father, and say, *Father we haue sinned against heauen and before thee, and are no more worthy to be called thy sons:* we cannot expect he should acknowledge vs for his sonnes; all our ambition is to be as one of his hired seruants. Ler vs first goe about to be freed from this prison, to escape this punishment, before we dreame of possessing his kingdome: and therefore our Saiour saith, *come vnto me*. What, you that thinke of

rising

rising vp, and taking possession? No, but *all yee that are weary, and heauy laden, and I will ease you*; as if he should say, come vnto me as I am a IESVS, for this is the first thing you must thinke of; he that will not lay hold vpon him, as he is a IESVS, shall neuer bee partaker of him, as he is a Christ: be sure first hee is your IESVS, and then after in good time, he will be your Christ.

This was the chiefe and principall intent of his comming: *The sonne of man came to seeke and to saue that which was lost*; that is, he came to be a IESVS: & againe, *The sonne of man is not come to destroy mens liues, but to saue them*, Luk. 9. 56. that is, he came to be a IESVS. And againe, *I am not come*, saith he, *to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance*: that is, as I expound it, I came not to call the proud Scribes, and Pharises; but the poore penitent Publican; I came not to call those that trusted in their own righteousnesse; but I came to call those that did confesse and bewaile their manifold wickednesse; In a word, I came not to call those that thought themselues fit for my kingdome, and so lookt for mee as a Christ; but, I came to call those that thought they iustly deserued the punishment of hell, and so lookt for mee as a IESVS.

Mat. 18. 11.

Mat. 9. 13.

Prinne.

Fiftly, That name by which our Saviour was most of all confessed, acknowledged, and enquired after, and by which his kingdome and power are most set forth in Scripture, is his most honourable name. But our Sauiour was most of all confessed

confessed, acknowledged, enquired after, & his kingdome and power most of all set forth in Scripture by his name Christ, not Iesus. Hence the *Magi, Mat.* 2, 4. *inquire where Christ* [not Iesus] *should be borne.* Hence *Iohn Baptist, when the people enquired who he was, confessed, that he was not the Christ* [not Iesus] *Iohn* 1.20. & 2.28. Hence *the people confesse that our Sauiour was the very Christ, &c. Iohn* 7.26.27. 31.41. Hence *the woman of Samaria demanded, is not this the Christ?* and the *Samaritans themselues replied, Now wee beleeue and knowe, that this is indeed the Christ,* [not the Iesus] *the Saviour of the world. Iohn.* 4. 25. 29. 42. Hence the *Priests and Pharises demanded of him, whether hee were the Christ or not. Mat.* 26.63. *Luke* 22.67. Hence *the Divells themselues cryed out, and said thou art Christ the Son of God, for they knewe that he was Christ. Luke* 4. 41. Hence *the Angells tell the Shepheards, that there was borne to them a Saviour, which was Christ* [not Iesus] *the Lord. Luke* 2.11. & *the Apostles being demanded of our Sauiour, who he was; make this reply by Peter in all their names, Thou art Christ,* [not Iesus] *the Sonne of the liuing God: Thou art the Christ of God. Mat* 16.16. *Luke* 9.20. *Ioh.* 6.69. Hence *Act.* 2.36. he is *said to be made both Lord and Christ:* and *Act.* 4.26. *The Kings of the earth stand vp, and the Rulers are gathered together against the Lord, and against his Christ,* not Iesus. Hence *Rev.* 11.15. *There were great voices in heauen, saying, The Kingdomes of the world are become the Kingdomes of the Lord, and of his Christ* [not Iesus] And *Rev.* 12 10. *Now is come salvation and strength, and the Kingdome of God, and the power of his Christ, &c. Rev.* 20 4. 6. *And I saw a throne &c. and they liued and raigned with Christ a thousand yeares: They shall be Priests of God, and of Christ, and shall raigne with him a thousand yeares.* Hence *S. Paul* proclaimeth; *that he was not ashamed of the Gospell of Christ: That he desired to knowe nothing but Christ crucified: That hee preached to the Gentiles the vnsearchable riches of Christ: That*

he

he accounted all things losse and dung, that hee might winne Christ: That he desired to be dissolued, and to be with Christ, which was best of all. All which with infinite other Texts of Scripture (together with all the Fathers, and our owne *Articles*, who more commonly stile our Sauiour in all their *Writings Christ*, than Iesus) sufficiently confirme my Minor, and so by consequence the conclusion too.

Answer.

I could answer you here, first by way of retortion, that he was most of all confessed, acknowledged and enquired after, and his kingdome, and power are most of all set forth in scripture by his name IESVS, not Christ. First his kingdome and power is most set forth vnder this name: hence it is that the Apostle saith. Heb. 4. 14. *Seeing then we haue a great high Priest that is past into the Heauens, Iesus* (not Christ) *the sonne of God*, and Heb. 7. 22. *by so much was* IESVS (not Christ) *made surety of a better Testament.* And againe Heb. 12. 2. *Looking vnto* IESVS (not Christ) *the author and finisher of our faith*: and vers. 24. *and to* IESVS (not Christ) *the Mediator of the new Testament.* Hence it is 2. Thess. 1. 7. *When the Lord* IESVS (not Christ) *shall be revealed from heauen with his mighty Angells*; and 2. Cor. 4. 14. *God shall raise vs vp by* IESVS (not Christ) Act. 1. 11. *The two men in white apparell, said vnto me yee men of Gallilee why stand you gazing vp into heauen this same* Iesus (not Christ) *which is taken vp from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner, as you haue seen him goe into heauen.*

Hence *Acts* 3. 13. *the God of* Abraham *and of* Isaack *and* Iacob *the God of our Fathers hath glorified his sonne* Iesus (not Christ) So Acts the 7.55. *Stevenbeing full of the holy Ghost looked vp stedfastly into heauen and saw the glory of God and* Iesus (not Christ) *standing on the right hand of God.* Thus Reve: 22. 16. *I* Iesus (not Christ) *haue sent my Angell to testifie these things vnto you in the Churches.*

Hence it is, that the *Evangelists* almost alwaies call him IESVS (not Christ) at his working of myracles as *Ioh:* 2. 11. *this beginning of myracles did* IESVS (not Christ) *in Cana of Galile, and manifested forth his glory:so* Ioh:6.14. *then those men when they had seene the myracles that* IESVS (not Christ) *did* and Ioh: 4. 54. *this againe is the second myracle that* IESVS (not Christ) *did*; and when hee had rayſed *Lazarus* from the dead, the *Evangelist* saith *Ioh:* 11. 45. 46. *then many of the Iewes which came to Mary, and had seene the things which* IESVS (not Christ) *did, but some of them went their wayes to the Pharises and told them what things* IESVS (not Christ) *had done: so Luke:* 9. 42. 43. *and* IESVS (not Christ) *rebuked the vncleane spirit and healed the Child, and they were all amazed at the mighty power of God, but while they wondred every one at all things which* IESVS (not Christ) *did.* And Acts 2.22. *yee men of Israell heare these wordes* IESVS (not Christ) *of Nazareth a man approued of God among you by myracles wonders and signes which God did by him in the middest of you.*

This was the name also wherein he was especially

ly enquired after, confessed, and acknowledged: witnesse *Ephes:* 1.15. *wherefore I also after I heard of your faith in the Lord* Iesus (not Christ) *So,* 1. *Io.*5. 5. *who is hee that ouercometh the world but he that beleiueth that* Iesus (not Christ) *is the sonne of God, likewise Collos.* 3. 17. *whatsoever you doe in word or deede doe all in the name of the* Lord Iesus (not Christ) *giuing thanks vnto the Father by him* 2. Cor: 4. 5. *our selues your servants for* Iesus (not Christ) *sake* Acts 19. 17. *feare fell on them all and the name of the* Lord Iesus (not Christ) *was magnified.*

Yea some of the Iewes magnified this name as Acts 19.13. *wee adiure you by* Iesus (not Christ) *whom* Paule *preacheth; I verely said St.* Paule Acts 26.9. *thought with my selfe that I ought to doe many thinges contrary to the name of* Iesus (not Christ) *of Nazareth.* Rom. 10. 9. *if thou wilt confesse with thy mouth the Lord* Iesus (not Christ.) Hence Revel: 19.10. *the Angell said I am thy fellow servant and of thy brethren that haue the testimony of* IESVS (not Christ) *worship God.* Thus Mat:21.11. *and the multitude said, this is* IESVS (not Christ) *the Prophet of* Nazareth *of* Galile So Mat: 28. 5. *and the Angell answered and said vnto the woman feare not yee, for I know that ye seeke* IESVS (not Christ) *which was crucified.* Hence Luk: 24. 19. *Hast thou not knowne the things that are come to passe concerning* Iesus (not Christ) *of* Nazareth *which was a Prophet mihhty indeede and word before God and all the People.* Ioh:12.11. *by reason of* Lazarus *many of the Iewes*

went away and beleeued on IESVS (not Christ.) Thus Ioh.12.21. *Certaine Greeks came to Philip and desired him saying, Sir we would see* IESVS (not Christ.) Hence Ioh.18.7. *then asked he them againe, whom seeke ye, and they said* IESVS (not Christ) *of Nazareth. Thus* Zacheus *sought to see* IESVS (not Christ) *who he was,* Luke 19.3.&c. Doe but turne ouer the Evangelists to this purpose, and you shall finde where he is named *Christ* once, he is named IESVS at the least ten times.

And this is the name which the Divells themselues with feare and trembling, confesse, and acknowledge Mark.1.24. *let vs alone what haue wee to doe with thee thou* Iesus (not Christ) *of Nazareth art thou come to destroy vs.* So likewise another cryed and said, *what haue I to doe with thee* Iesus (not Christ) *the sonne of the most high God.* Mark.5.7.

Christus vel pontificale vel regium nomen est, Iesus Hebræi vocabuli nomen est quod apud nos salvator dicitur Christus a Chrismate, id est, ab unctione appellatur: quia ergo ostendimus quid sit Iesus qui populum saluet, & quid sit Christus qui pontifex sacrifitus sit in æternum, &c. Cyprian in Symbolum expositio Chrysologus Ser. 17. de Symbolo.

Secondly I answere, suppose the Scripture should more commonly set forth his kingdome and power, by the name of Christ, then the name of IESVS; it were no marvaile; for Christ indeede is a soueraigne and commaunding name, including in it his three offices of King Priest and Prophet. And indeede to speake properly his name Christ, hath relation to his kingdome, he hath purchased for vs: but his name IESVS, hath relation to that misery from whence hee hath redeemed us; the one lookes to Heauen the other to hell; as Saint *Cyprian* hath long agoe obserued, *this name Christ*, saith he, *is the name of an Heabrew word, which signifieth with vs as much as Sa-*

uiour,

uiour, but But Christ is so called from Chrisme, *that is vnction: seeing therefore,* saith he, *wee haue shewed what is* IESVS, *to wit, he that saues his people, and what is* Christ, *to wit, he that is made an high Priest for ever &c.* There need then be no strife betweene these names, since they looke severall waies, and the one hath relation to our enioying of Heauen, the other to our freedome from hell; which me thinks, the Apostle doth very punctually set downe when he saith that *God would haue vs waite for his sonne from heauen, whom he raised from the dead; even* IESVS, *who delivereth vs from the wrath to come:* as if he should say, would you consider your deliuerance from the wrath to come, then thinke of a IESVS: & did you but seriously consider of this wrath to come; did you but weigh with your selfe the fiercenesse and continuance of those raging flames (from which God of his infinite mercy deliuer vs all) you would more highly esteeme of this name IESVS. For wee reverence him more for his pitty, then his power; more for his mercy, then his maiesty: which mercy, pitty, tender loue, and bowels of compassion towards mankind, is wrapped vp all together in this sweet name IESVS as I haue elsewhere declared. 1 Thes. 1. 10.

And it is worth our obseruing, that when any came to our Saviour for helpe and succour to bee eased of their diseases and infirmities, they did come vnto him vnder this name onely; and therefore we read that blinde *Bartimeus* when hee heard that it was *Iesus* of *Nazareth* hee began to cry out

Mark.10.47. and say, IESVS (not Christ) *thou sonne of David haue mercy on me*, And so Saint *Luke* relates his speech, and he cryed saying, *Iesus* (not Christ) *thou sonne of David haue mercy on me*. Thus the tenne Lepers, Luk.18.38. which came to Christ, lifted vp their voices and Luk.17.13. said, *Iesus* (not Christ) *master haue mercy on vs*. Likewise a man that was cured of an infirmity, which he had thirty and eight years, told the *Iewes* Ioh.5.15. that it *was* IESVS (not Christ) *which had made him whole*. So when the *Iewes* asked him that had beene blind, how his eyes were opened, he answered and Ioh.9.11. said; *a man that is called* IESVS (not Christ) *made clay and annointed mine eyes. Yea when great multitudes came vnto him hauing with them those that* Mat.15.30. *were lame, blinde, dumbe, maimed, and many others*, the Evangelist saith, *they cast them downe at* IESVS (not Christs) *feete, and he healed them*. Thus when *Iairus* was about to desire our Sauiour to come into his house to heale his onely daughter, the text saith that *he fell downe at* IESVS (not Christs) *feete* Luke. 8.41. Thus the blessed martyr Saint *Steuen* being now ready to giue vp the Ghost, called vpon God, saying; *Lord* IESVS (not Christ) *receiue my spirit*. Acts 7.59. And as we desire to goe vnto him at our death as a IESVS, so would we haue him come vnto vs in iudgement, as a IESVS; and therefore we read, *even so come Lord* IESVS (not Christ) Rev.22.20.

Prynne.

Sixtly, That name of our Saviour which denominates his Gospell, his Sacraments, his Church, his Apostles, his Ministers

Ministers, his Saints, his Kingdome; must needs be more venerable and glorious vnto Christians, than that name which denominates none of these. But the name of Christ, not Iesus, denominates all these. First, it denominates his Gospell, which is stiled *the word, and Gospell of Christ, the vnsearchable riches of Christ, the sweete savour of Christ, yea Christ himselfe,* [not Iesus:] *Rom.*1.16. *c.*15.19.20.29.1 *Cor.* 9.12.18. 2 *Cor.*2.12. *c.*4.14. *Gall.*1.7.15.16.18. *Phil.*1.27. 1 *Thes.* 3.2. 2 *Thes.*1:8. *Eph.*3.4.6,8. *c:*4.20. *Acts* 24.24. 1 *Cor.*1.23. 2.*Iohn*,9. Secondly it denominates his Sacraments, which are stiled the *Baptisme of Christ*, and *the communion of the body and blood of Christ*, [not Iesus.] Thirdly it denominates his Church, which is stiled, the *Church, and Churches of Christ, Rom.* 16.16. not of Iesus. *The body, flesh, wife, and members of Christ,* 1 *Cor.*12. 27. *Ephes.*4,12.13. 15.*c.*5.23.*to* 33.*Col.*1.24. not of Iesus. Yea *Christ himselfe,* 1.*Cor.* 12.22. *As the body is one, &c. so also is* Christ, not Iesus. Fourthly it denominates his Apostles and Ministers, which are stiled, the *Apostles, Ministers, servants, and Embassadours of Christ*, not Iesus, *Instructors in Christ; a sweet savour of Christ,* and *the glory of Christ,* not of Iesus, Fiftly it denominates his Saints, who are stiled, *Christians,* [not Iesuites] *Acts* 11.26.*c.*26.28.1, *Pet.*4,16. *The members of Christ, Eph:*5,30.31.32: 1 *Cor.* 6.15. not of Iesus. *The Epistle of Christ,* 2. *Cor:*3.3. not of Iesus: *Heires annexed with Christ, and heires of God through Christ.* (not Iesus) *Rom.* 8.17.*Gal*,4.7. *Babes in* Christ, 1. *Cor.*3.1. *and Servants of Christ, Gal:*1.10. *c.*6.6. *Ephes:* 6.5.6. Hence Christians are are said, *to be in* Christ, *and* Christ *in them, Gal.*2.20. *Ephes.* 3.17.2 *Cor*,5.17. *To have* Christ *formed in them. Gal*,4.19. *To be baptised into* Christ, *and to put on* Christ *Gal:*1.21,*c*,3. 37.*Rom*,16.5,7. *To be* Christs, *Gal:*3.29.*c.* ,24.1 *Cor:*3.23. *c.*11.1.*Cor.*15,23,2 *Cor*,10.7, *To be all one in Christ, Gal:* 3. 28. *Ephes:* 1, 10. *To be in obedience and subiection vnto Christ*, [not Iesus] *Ephes.*5.23.24.*c.*6.5.6.2 *Cor.*9.13, & 10.

5.7.

5.7.as to their soueraigne Lord and Master. *And to be Priests of Christ*,[not Iesus] *Rev:*20.6.*c.*1.6. Sixthly,it denominates his Kingdome; which is stiled,*the Kingdome of Christ*,*Ephes.* 5.5. *Rev:*11.15. not of Iesus. Therefore it must needs bee more venerable and glorious among Christians, than the name Iesus is; which giues no such denominations to them, to these, as it.

Answere.

Here againe I could answere you by retortion, that first the name *Iesus* (not Christ) denominates his Gospell, witnesse Act.4.2. *the* Saduces *were grieved that the Apostles taught the people and preached through* Iesus (not Christ)*the resurrection from the dead*, and in the 18 verse, *the rulers called them and commaunded them not to speake at all nor teach in the name of* Iesus (not Christ) and againe Acts 5.40. *when they had called the Apostles and beaten them, they commaunded them that they should not speake in the name of* Iesus (not Christ) so Acts 17.18. *Paul seemed to be a setter forth of strange Gods, because he preached vnto them* Iesus (not Christ)*and the resurrection.* Acts 28.23: *came many to* Pauls *lodging,to whom he expounded and testified the kingdome of God perswading them concerning* Iesus (not Christ.) So Revel.14.12. *here is the patience of the Saints, here are they that keepe the commaundements of God, and the faith of* Iesus (not Christ.) Secondly, it denominates his Sacraments; *for wee read that they were baptized in the name of the Lord* Iesus (not Christ) Act.15.5. And Ioh.5.1. *the* Pharises *heard that*

Iesus

IESVS. (not Christ) *made and baptized more Disciples then Iohn.*

Thirdly it denominates his Church as Act.9.5. where those that persecute Christs Church are said to persecute Iesus (not Christ) *I am Iesus whom thou persecutest*, So likewise Act.22.8. *Paule answered, who art thou Lord; and he said vnto me I am Iesus* (not Christ) *of Nazareth whom thou persecutest*; and againe, Act. 26. 15. *I am Iesus* (not Christ) *whom thou persecutest.*

Fourthly it denominates his Apostles and Ministers; therefore we read, that *Ioseph of Arimathea was Iesus* (not Christ) *Disciple*, Mat.27.57. So Ioh.1. 37. *The two Disciples when they heard him speake they followed Iesus* (not Christ) *and his Disciples.* Ioh.6.24. *Iesus* (not Christ) *was not there neither his Disciples.* Ioh 13.23. *There was leaning on Iesus* (not Christs) *bosome one of his Disciples.* And Mat. 27.55. *We read of many women which followed Iesus* (not Christ) *from Gallile ministring vnto him.*

Fiftly it denominates his Saints. As Revel. 17.6. *I saw the woman drunken with the blood of the Saints and with the blood of the Martyres of* IESVS (not Christ) And againe, Reuel.20.4. *I saw the soules of them that were beheaded for the witnesse of* IESVS (not Christ) *and for the word of God.* But the Saints of God are called Christians not Iesuits for very good reason. First because, as I told you, Iesus is a name incommunicable; for would you haue vs all Iesuits or Iesusses, this cannot be for Isa. 43. 11. *I, euen I am the Lord, and besides me there is no Iesus no*

Saviour; but this name Christ is communicable to vs; for we are anointed in this world, as the Apostle saith, *The anointing which yee haue receiued, abideth in you, and yee need not that any man teach you, but as the same anointing teacheth you of all things*; and wee shall *hereafter be anointed, for we shall bee made vnto our God Kings, & Priests, & shall raigne with Christ*, because he will make vs partakers of his anointing; but we are not called the members of IESVS because we doe not, we cannot partake of his office, of sauing others.

1.Ioh,2.2.7.

Rev.5.10.

Secondly, we are called after the name of Christ and not after the name of IESVS, for our greater comfort and consolation: for by being called Christians, wee are put in minde of our dignity, honour, and high preferment, that we shall enioy in Christ; that we shall be anointed to bee Kings, Priests, and Prophets; but if we were called after his name IESVS, that would put vs in minde of sorrowes & sufferings, of bitter agonies, and shedding of blood; which would be a great discouragement & disheartning of vs, and therefore, the Gospell is vsually called the Gospell of Christ (not Iesus) his Apostles and Ministers very often called the Apostles & Ministers of Christ (not IESVS) yea his Churches, the churches of Christ not Iesus; and all to shew that we are to be partakers of that ioy, and happinesse, he hath purchased for vs; but not of those sorrowes and sufferings, he hath endured for vs.

Sixtly, the name of IESVS denominates his kingdome and power, as I haue proued before, to which take

take these places also, Heb.4.14. Hence that great day of iudgement is called *the day of the Lord* IESVS (not Christ) 1.Cor.5.5.2.Cor.1.14.and Act.17.7. *The Iewes accused the brethren, who said there is another King one* IESVS (not Christ.)

Secondly, I answere you as before, that all these places brought by you, shew indeed that the name Christ may be a name of greater eminency, and authority and dignity; but not of greater fauour, and mercy, and therefore not more to be honoured and reuerenced of vs.

Prynne.

Lastly, Christians haue as much cause to reverence and honour the name of Christ, as Iesus. For, as the Scripture saith, *That Christ died for them, loued, saued, redeemed them*, and the like: so it records, *That Christ giues them light*, Eph 5.14. *That Christ hath made them free*, Gal.5.1. *That Christ doth strengthen them to doe all things*, Phil.4.13. *That Christ doth forgiue them*, Col.3.13. *That they serue the Lord Christ*, Col.3.24. *That Christ is their consolation*, 2.Cor.1.5. Phil.2.1. *That Christ is in them the hope of glory*, Col.1.27. *That Christ is their life, and that their liues are hid with Christ in God*, Col.3.3.4. *That Christ liueth in them, and that they liue by him*, Gal.2.20. *That Christ dwels in their hearts by faith*, Eph. 3.17. *That Christ is for them an high Priest of good things to come*, Heb.9.11. *That God was in Christ reconciling the world to himselfe*, 2.Cor.5.19. *That Christ loueth them; that this loue of Christ to them surpasseth knowledge; and that nothing shall be euer able to sever them from Christ loue, which constraineth them to liue vnto him*, Ephes. 5.25. 2.Cor.5.14. Eph.3.13. Rom.8.35. *That Christ is all and in all, yea all vnto them*, Col.3.11. Eph.1.20.23. Which conside-

rations made *Paul* to prise Christ so much; as to *count all things losse and dung to win Christ*; and to *desire to bee dissolved and to be with Christ, which was best of all.* Therefore certainely, Christ, and his name Christ, (which *name the Emperour Constantine, with other Christian Emperours, and their Christian Souldiers did so much honour, as to engrane and weare it both in their helmets and their ensignes*: whereas we never read that they gaue such honour to this name Iesus:) is as honourable as great, as worthy reverence, capping & bowing, as Iesus, or his name Iesus, which comes short of his name Christ, in all these respects. And let this for ever silence the superstitious bowers at the name of Iesus, who engrosse all reverence and honour to the name of Iesus alone, preferring it aboue all other Titles of our Saviour; yea before his stile of Christ, of *Saviour*, which is the same with Iesus, and doth more really and fully expresse his office of a Saviour (it being the very *title of that office* in the Scripture) that his name Iesus doth.

Answere.

Here is no new reason brought, but a continuation of places out of the Scripture, where Christ is named and not IESVS; as though it were not as easie to bring as many places where IESVS is named and not Christ; yea were I disposed to goe ouer the foure Evangelists, I could easily make it appeare, that where Christ is named once, IESVS is named at the least ten times; but this is needlesse, euery one that can read, may easily obserue it. Thus 1. Cor. 6. 11. *But yee are washed, but yee are sanctified, but yee are iustified in the name of the Lord Iesus* (not Christ) Phil. 2. 19. *I trust in the Lord Iesus* (not Christ) *to send Timotheus vnto you*, Ephes. 1. 15. *Wherefore also after I heard of your faith in the Lord* IESVS (not Christ

Christ) *and loue vnto all the Saints.* Eph.4.21. *If so be you haue heard him and haue beene taught by him as the truth is in* IESVS (not Christ) *Wherefore I giue you to vnderstand that no man speaking by the spirit of God calleth* IESVS (not Christ) *accursed, and that no man can say that* IESVS (not Christ) *is the Lord but by the holy Ghost.* 1.Cor.12.3. So Rom. 3.26. *That he might bee iust, and be iustifier of him which beleeveth in* IESVS (not Christ) And Act.1.1. *The former treatise haue I made O Theophilus of all that* IESVS (not Christ) *began both to doe and teach.* Act.2.22. *Yee men of Israel heare these words,* IESVS (not Christ) *of Nazareth a man approued of God among you by miracles, wonders, and signes.* Act.4.18. *And they called and commanded them not to speake at all, nor teach in the name of Iesus* (not Christ) vers.27. *For of a truth against thy holy Child* IESVS (not Christ) Act.4.30. *That signes and wonders may bee done by the name of the holy child* IESVS (not Christ) Rev.14.12. *Here is the patience of Saints, here are they that keep the commandements of God & the faith of* IESVS (not Christ) Rev.19.10. *I am thy fellow seruant, and of thy brethren, that haue the testimony of Iesus* (not Christ) Rev.22.16. *I Iesus* (not Christ) *sent myne Angell to testifie these things vnto you in the Churches.*

And well might the Emperour *Constantine* engraue the name Christ in his helmet; because this name Christ is communicable, especially to Kings and Emperours, who are alwaies stiled in Scripture *Christi, Christs*; and *Christi Domini*, the *Lords*

Christs; and not only Kings, but all Christians are anointed, and partake of this name of Christ: but not of the name Iesus; that is peculiar to our Saviour, and not to be ascribed to any king or Emperour whatsoeuer, neither is any to bee called after this name, but as *Tertullian* saith, I *challenge to myselfe this name Christ*, for from him I am called a Christian, but I challenge not to my selfe Iesus, I dare not be called a Iesuite, *this name* Iesus I *defend* for my vse.

Mihi vendico christum mihi defendo Iesum Tertull. lib. 3. ad Marcion cap. 16.

And let this for euer silence the superstitious oppugners of bowing at the name of Iesus, who deny all reverence and honour to the name Iesus debasing it below all other titles of our Sauiour, as below the name, *Christ*, *Emanuel*, *Lord*, *Mediator*, and the like.

The

THe laſt thing to bee examined is whether the 18 Canon of our Church would haue vs performe any ſuch reuerence as bowing of the knee at the name of *Ieſus*.

In your former tract you would not vouchſafe ſo much as to mention this canon; here you mention it, and would make vs beleeue that the canon intends no ſuch matter as to commaund vs an outward geſture or reuerence at the name of *Ieſus*. And now, *I* marvayle not, that you deny this bowing to bee a duty of the text; when as you cannot perſwade your ſelfe, that it is the meaning and intent of the church; the canon being ſo playne which is this: Pag. 46.

When in time of Divine ſervice the Lord *Ieſus* ſhall be mentioned, due and lowly reverence ſhall be done by all perſons preſent; as it hath beene accuſtomed; teſtifying by theſe outward ceremonies and geſtures, their inward humility, Chriſtian reſolution, and

and due acknowledgement that the Lord *Iesus Christ*, the true and eternall sonne of God is the only Sauiour of the World, in whom alone all the mercies, graces, and promises of God to mankind, for this life and the life to come, are fully and Wholy comprised.

Should the witt of man striue to expresse that in writing which wee practise and I labour to confirme, I thinke it could not be done more fully and plainely then is sett downe in the canon. Yet haue you diuers cavills against it; the first is in your margent where you say, *it is a canon onely of direction by way of advise, not of obligation by way of command, there being no penalty expressed in it.*

To which I answere, that our Church indeede, in the beginning of this canon sayth *for order and decency in time of diuine service we iudge these our* directions *following* But I hope you know, that the Churches directions, are her commands; witnesse the words immediately following, where these directions begin. *No man* shall *couer his head in the Church or chapell in time of diuine service* which is a flat prohibition to be couered, and a command to be vncovered as you confesse here afterwards.

The canon goes on: *All maner of persons then present shall reverently kneele vpon their knees, when the generall confession, Letany and other prayers are read; and shall stand vp at the saying of the beleeife and likewise*

likewise when in time of divine service the Lord IESVS *shalbe mentioned due and lowly reuerence* shalbe *done by all persons present. &c.*

I know not what this word *shall* signifies in the common Law; but in diuinitie and our ordinarie discourse, when any on saith you *shall* doe this or you *shall* doe that, we take it for an imperious and commaunding speech.

But this is no commaund say you *because there is no penalty expressed in it*; no more is there any penalty expressed against those, that stand not vp at the beleife, or be not vncouered in time of divine service, and yet you confesse this to bee not only a command of the Church, but euen of the text also.

Your second evasion of our Cannon is (*That there is no such clause, that all present at divine service should bow at the name of Iesus, the words of the Cannon being, that when in time of divine service the Lord* Iesus (*which hath reference onely to the person of* Iesus *represented vnto vs vnder any of his names*) *not the name of* Iesus, *should bee mentioned, &c.* I, vnder any of his names? What doth the canon wish vs to doe lowly reverence to an *Individuum vagum?* will any name serue the turne? then it seemes by this Cannon, one may doe reverence at the name Christ; another at the name Emanuell; another at the name, Lord of Lords; another at the name son of God; another at the name Mediator; a nother at the name King of Kings; another at the name Mighty God; another at the name Prince of Peace, &c. So

 that

that so many men in a Church, might choose them so many names, and one bow to this, another to that, as they come. Can you imagine that the Church should meane thus? were not this then a strange Canon to speake thus confusedly, to leaue men thus at large? If this were so, yet you doe not obserue it, for you will not bow to any of his names; no, not to his name Lord, which you so highly magnify in your first booke; nor to his name Christ, which you seeme to preferre in this second tract: but the words in the Canon are plaine enough, *(when in time of Divine service the Lord* Iesus *shall be mentioned)* that is, as any of the meanest capacity will at the first easily conceaue, when they shall heare this name *Iesus* named, mentioned or pronounced, and that not any Iesus, but our Lord *Iesus*, that is, that *Iesus* who is our Lord and Saviour. And therefore to shew that this name and no other is intended, the Printer no doubt not without speciall direction, set downe this name IESVS in a different & greater letter; and that the Canon meaneth no other name but this, appeares by the reason afterwards declared to *testify*, saith the Canon, *that he is the onely Saviour of the World*, therefore wee doe it at the name *Iesus*, and no other name.

Your third exception is, that our Canon saith, *due and lowly reverence (not bowing of the head or knee much lesse the putting off the hatt which this Canon forbids men to put on in time of divine service) shall be done by all persons present, &c.*

As if due and lowly reuerence did not comprehend

hend in it bowing of the knee, or of the head; for I hope, he that bowes the knee or the head may rightly be said to doe lowly reuerence, and our Church hath wiselie and warilie abstained from those particuler phrases of bowing the body, or bowing the knee; and vseth a generall speech, which may comprehend them all: and I haue told you before, that bowing of the knee is put for any kind of lowly reverence, or outward gesture of submission: but I hope you will not say, but that putting off the hat, is a kind of due reuerence; though, as you say, in time of divine service, men should not be couered at all: and therefore this canon, which speakes onely of diuine service, would haue vs, when our hats are off, to bend our bodies or knees at this name, but the iniunction of Queene *Elizabeth*, would haue this respect to bee done at Sermons, when commonly men are couered, and therefore there is expresse command of putting off the hat: so these two canons agree well together, the one would haue vs in sermons doe this honour to the name, by putting of the hat: the other, by bowing the body to it, when the head is before vncouered; and both of them fully expound that bowing of the knee mentioned in the *Philipians*.

Your last exception is in the margent, where you expound what is meant by due and lowly reuerence; *that is, say you, such reverence as the scripture commandeth, for none else is due to Christ; whereas this bowing at the name of* IESVS, *is not commanded in scripture, for ought that can appeare, therefore not due.*

Let the reader marke heere how you would haue the scripture expound the canon of the Church, that you might haue the exposition of the scripture, and so make what you list of this lowly reuerence: what the meaning of the scripture is, I haue answered you before; now the question is what is the meaning of our canon, which in all likelyhood doth expound the scripture, not the scripture it: and that you may not fly here to a lowly reuerence of the heart onely, as you expound bowing of the knee to be the subiection onely of the hart, the canon expounds it selfe what is meant by lowlie reuerence, when it saith, *in testifying by these outward ceremonies and gestures*: so then, this due and lowly reuerence must be expressed by some outward ceremony, and gesture, which is all I striue for.

You giue a touch at Queene *Elizabeths* iniunctions and all that you can say against them is this, they be obsolete.

To which I reply no more but this, why then, if they be obsolete, and out of date, doe you vrge so many of them in the last leafe of this booke, to wit the 2. 3. 23. 25. and the last: it seemes when they make for you, then they be in force, when against you, then obsolete.

FINIS.